

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



600108053N



THE JESUITS.

THE JESUITS,

And other Essays.

BY
WILLIS NEVIN.

"LA VERITA È FIGLIA DEL TEMPO."



LONDON :
R. WASHBOURNE, 18 PATERNOSTER ROW.
1874.

110. h. 587

Digitized by Google



PREFACE.

IN consequence of the tracts on the Jesuits and other of my smaller publications being nearly all sold, I have determined to reproduce them, with additions and alterations, in a single volume.

Catholics in Ireland and England are not fond of "tracts," and especially is this observable in the case of the "Clifton tracts," which in single numbers have hardly any sale, while in the volume form there is still a moderate sale. Considering the fact that Protestants of all kinds, and in particular, Ritualists, do gain numerous adherents to their views by means of "tracts," I am sorry Catholics should not appreciate a weapon which their opponents use to advantage. The fact that the old heathen, Aristotle, has been so valuable to Catholics, is a lasting proof

that we may learn from non-Catholics how to turn neutral or opposing forces to account. However, in my particular case, I must thank Catholics for the encouragement I have received from them, and hope that now I have taken away from my former readers the necessity of alluding to tracts on the Jesuits, etc., I shall find my old supporters will once again aid me in my attempts to give antidotes to the daily falsehoods of the London Press.

The "Tablet" for June 14th, 1873, favourably mentioned my tracts on the Jesuits, but added: "We might suggest a little more polish in the style of the shorter tracts. . . . Their information is large, while their logic is often very effective."

I can, when necessity requires, write as sedately as the Seer of Printing House-square could desire, but I have come to the conclusion that plain Saxon, though it may sometimes offend polite ears, yet sticks in the memory; and as my intention has never been to please, but always to make enemies—remember the Catholic side of the questions of the day—I am willing to lessen polish if I can gain adherents.

ELMHURST, FAREHAM,

March, 1874.



CONTENTS.

THE JESUITS AND THEIR DANGEROUS DESIGNS .	1
WHY THE JESUITS WERE EXPELLED FROM GER-	
MANY	9
HOW THE JESUITS FARED IN PRUSSIA ONE	
HUNDRED YEARS AGO	27
PERSECUTION OF THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND .	47
ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS DISLOYAL? . . .	53
THE POPE AND LIBERTY	57
PROTESTANTISM	63
ANGLICANISM	83
ROMANISM	101

THE LATE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER ON THE HIGH ANGLICAN THEORY OF ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS	143
A WORD ABOUT RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTIES . . .	147
A FEW MINUTES' THOUGHT ON AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT	175



THE JESUITS AND THEIR DANGEROUS DESIGNS.

THE foundation-stone whereon Protestantism has been erected is "Liberty of Conscience, the Right of Private Judgment." What a base lie it is for Protestants to profess such liberty of conscience, and yet deny it to those whose ideas are different from their own! What right has any man who calls himself a Liberal, what right has any man who says his religion is based on the right of private judgment, to declare that there shall be no such liberty for those thousands, yea, millions of Christians who are known by the name of Catholics? The present persecution of the Jesuits is the work of the "kings of the earth!" of those who

are absolutely and resolutely opposed to the liberal tendencies of the age. The monarch who is the chief opponent of the Jesuits is a man who believes he is a divinely-appointed King. And yet who are those men who join hand-in-hand with these despots? The Democrats, the so-called LIBERALS of Europe! Well may any honest consistent Liberal utter the words, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" Is liberty always to be a lie? Does it always mean persecution and oppression? A cry which comes from the long past has been caught up of late by those true Liberals and yet Roman Catholics, the Count de Montalembert and Father Lacordaire, a cry of "God and liberty." The two must go together; there can be no liberty without God.

The Count, writing to an English gentleman, observed:—"I need not, even if I had time, enter into details about the state of France or Europe; we are all progressing onwards to the bottomless pit of Socialism,

which is nothing else but the logical conclusion of Protestantism and Democracy. Nothing, I am convinced, can or will save us. Thanks to Louis Buonaparte, we have now a short halt on the road, but we shall ere long move on. As you most justly say, the day of Europe is past: she has sinned too deeply to be forgiven. Every power except the Church will be utterly destroyed; but let us beware of becoming to any degree the instruments or accomplices of the work of destruction." (Memoir of Count de Montalembert, *Blackwood and Sons*.) Human nature cannot be altered by School Boards, not even by the Ballot, and human nature *left to itself* is utterly selfish. It seeks its own advantage, unmindful of the welfare of others. It is, therefore, self-evident that so long as man is left with nothing to curb his passions, with no belief in a right and wrong apart from the law of the land, there can be no *true* liberty. The laws are founded and carried out in accordance with the wishes of the people; if

4 *The Jesuits, and other Essays.*

the laws no longer represented the opinion of the nation, a very short time would elapse before a repeal of what was obnoxious would take place. If people, if the nation live without a belief in God, their laws will gradually cease to be made in accordance with what is right and just, and will be given simply to please the men of the day. Then there will be tyranny; then will an effete Protestantism be as much persecuted as are Jesuits in 1874; then will selfishness reign supreme, and Socialism and devilry rule the day. What is there to oppose such a falling away? Simply causing the law to be based on the law of God and not on FORCE.

Does any man live who can say that persecution of a society devoted to the service of Almighty God, and chiefly employed in education, can be according to any Divine law? Is it not self-evident that the principle conceded by this persecution is that principle of selfishness which is opposed to all true liberty? The reason of this persecution is in one word

simply this: the Jesuits put God and His Divine law above man and his human law. They acknowledge a God, and they believe that this God has revealed Himself to man and given a code of laws to the Church, which is His representative on earth. To persecute men who believe this, and act only on this, is to say that in every country religion must be such as to suit the rulers, or else there shall be none of it. Is this liberty? No! It is liberty for Atheists, but not liberty for those who claim it as their right to worship God as they like. Scotchmen three hundred years ago claimed that right, as English Episcopalians well know: the Jesuits claim no more.

For Protestants to aid in persecuting Jesuits is to league themselves with those Communists and human devils who hate ALL RELIGION, who will use the shortsightedness of Protestants to assist them in suppressing the Jesuits, and then, having got in the wedge, will turn on Bible-Christians, on our "Dear Protestant Brethren," who *as yet* believe in

God, and therefore will be considered aliens and opposers of that goddess of Liberty who is leading men to hell at railway-speed. The Protestants will, I know, declare that the Jesuits are opposed to Jesus Christ and the Gospel. But I would ask such, "How do you know that you are right?" Only because you think so, only by right of private judgment, only because you think history is in favour of your views. Why then not grant the Jesuits the *same* liberty of thought, the *same* liberty to believe what *they* think the truth, the *same* liberty to think *they* have history in their favour.

For rest not all *alike* on history,
 Traditional or written? and history
 Must still be matter taken upon trust.
 (Lessing's "Nathan Der Weise.")

I venture to prophecy that, if the Jesuits are finally expelled from Germany, the Revolutionists and Socialists will, before ten years pass away, split up the empire which to-day is praised by all Protestant Englishmen.

The Jesuits and their Dangerous Designs. 7

The Jesuits are the only men who can successfully keep down Socialism. Turn them out of Europe, and the Internationalists will have the field all to themselves; and *then*, ye respectable citizens of England, ye bankers and county gentlemen, ye purse-proud tradesmen, TREMBLE! Confiscation will then come to *you*, *you* who have gloated over the suppression of Religious Orders in Rome, of the Jesuits in Germany. How will *you* feel when, having destroyed the men who kept in check *your* foe, you find a mob of howling Infidels, Socialists and Communists, declaring that *all capitalists* are the foes of the nation? How bitterly will you regret when too late that you have hastened the evil day, by helping the *noble-minded* Bismarck to get rid of the poor persecuted children of St. Ignatius Loyola! Europe is now a mine charged with revolution and a false Democracy; little, very little is required to fire that mine, and then—it is not Roman Catholics only who will suffer, but every believer in God, every man who is

respectable, every man who has a five-pound note in a bank will be as obnoxious as the Jesuit. The rights of property will not be respected: why should they be so? Englishmen now, in 1874, encourage confiscation of the property of Jesuits because they don't like them; why, when men come who dislike *all* property, shall Protestants escape? It is the old truth, Englishmen support *revolution* abroad, calling it LIBERTY; and as surely as there is a God in heaven they will suffer for their selfishness and bigotry when the next great revolution, which will be a *Red* one, sweeps over Europe.



WHY THE JESUITS WERE EXPELLED FROM GERMANY.

WHY, indeed! Because they were dis-loyal—because they tried to destroy the German Empire by their underhand plotting — because they sought to set the ignorant peasants of southern Germany against Protestant Prussia.

Who does not know the horrible deeds wrought by these bloodthirsty men? What “father of a family” is there in Protestant England who does not know of their evil deeds in the pages of history?—how they tried to destroy the *virgin* Queen Elizabeth, and even attempted to blow up the Houses of Parliament in pursuance of their diabolical designs. Dear friend, do you not feel

10 *The Jesuits, and other Essays.*

sure that this is true? Do you not think that the expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany was decreed because of their political plottings against the State? "Yes," you answer, "of course I do." Well, then, let me tell you that you have made a mistake. You look astonished! You seem as if you would say, "What, I, who read my "Times" most religiously every morning! do *I* not know why the Jesuits were kicked out of Germany?" Even so,—even with the "Times" for your god you have made a mistake. Let me, then, ask for a few minutes' talk with you about these Jesuits, and I think I may throw a little new light on the subject,—a light which will enable you to see more clearly how the evil works of these men may be checked with more chance of success; and this must be my apology for asking you to read this chapter.

But, before I go further, I would beg you to observe one "*fact.*" I say deliberately and with intention one "*fact.*" I would

Why they were Expelled from Germany. 11

have you to know that, although the Jesuits were said by Bismarck and his allies to be political enemies of the empire, yet they were not tried for their *known* offences; they were not treated as are all political offenders;—heard, and tried, and then condemned. On the contrary, they were banished—unheard, untried, and *condemned*. I beg you to observe this *fact*; and the more so, because you are an Englishman, and consequently like “fair play” and love “justice.”

I will now go into the question of the “expulsion of the Jesuits;” and, in order fully to explain this event, must refer to certain ancient historical events. In a country in the east, called Palestine, there was an ancient race of men known by the name of “Jews.” Their country was conquered by the Romans, who ruled the land. A Jew was born, once on a time, who, when he was about thirty years old, came to the capital of the country, Jerusalem. His

life was a curious one; some few things connected with it are observable. He was a devout Jew, and obeyed the laws of the Jewish Church. He was looked on by the people as a prophet, for he wrought miracles and claimed to be God-sent. As time went on, he gained many disciples and became a known man. He had not preached and taught more than three years before he was accused of being an enemy of the State. It was said of him, "*This man is not Cæsar's friend.*" He was tried, but no proof was brought forward to condemn him, the few witnesses who did appear contradicted each other; nevertheless he was condemned, though not proved guilty, and was put to death. The name of this man was Jesus Christ; by many Englishmen HE is still believed to be God.

Now, one of His well-known sayings was, "Render to Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, but unto God *the things which be God's.*" He, furthermore, never claimed earthly rule; but

HE claimed *spiritual power*, He claimed to be the head of a *spiritual kingdom*; and HE never acted otherwise than in accordance with the laws of His country. Why then was HE condemned to death, when it was not proved, in a full court, that HE had committed any offence against the law? Because there was an idea among the mob and certain Jewish rulers that His spiritual kingdom was not compatible with the Government.

Most Englishmen believe that Jesus Christ was "*Not Guilty.*"

This was an event which happened, as I said, many hundred years ago. I now will relate another historical event which bears on the subject. There was, in the year 1872, a country called Germany, and this country was under a monarch called William, and his chief minister was Bismarck. In this king's dominions were nine or ten million men who were Christians, who believed that the before-mentioned Jesus Christ did establish a "*spiritual kingdom,*" and that Jesus

14 *The Jesuits, and other Essays.*

Christ was not "*guilty*," and did not commit "high treason," but was unjustly put to death. They believed, like their Master, in this "kingdom;" but, like their Master, were good citizens, rendering, like Him, "to Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's," *but*, like Him, "to God the things *which be God's*."

Jesus Christ established His kingdom, and died; but that "spiritual kingdom," HE promised his followers, should last till the end of the world. Where is that kingdom? I beg you to observe "*kingdom*;" not *republic*, but kingdom. There is but one *spiritual kingdom* on earth; and that is the *kingdom* which is under a *king*; and that king is Pope Pius IX.

That spiritual king, in the year 1868, as spiritual HEAD of the Church, promulgated certain *spiritual* truths, as before time did Jesus Christ. Some of these truths were disliked by the Emperor and his Minister: they said, "*This man is not Cæsar's friend!*" HE does not consult me about *spiritual* affairs.

Why they were Expelled from Germany. 15

HE says he is HEAD of the Church—the Spiritual Ruler of my subjects!! HE cannot be a ruler without interfering with my Kingship—therefore I say, “*Away with this man.*”

But this spiritual king, among many thousands of faithful servants, had, in particular, some known by the name of “Jesuits.”

The Emperor, therefore, knowing that a faithful servant will obey his master, at once banished from his kingdom the servants of that king who ruled a kingdom which Jesus Christ founded eighteen hundred and forty years ago.

Reader, I have thus far spoken half in parable—I will finish in plain words. Is there not a strange likeness between the treatment accorded to the Master and the servant? The Founder of the spiritual kingdom condemned to death for mere asserted treason, *with no proof*. The servants exiled from their own country—unheard, untried, and on mere assertion of treason.

It is a most strange sight to see how

Englishmen, who always boast of "liberty" and "justice," blindly condemn a number of men on the mere word of an arbitrary statesman. It is not a pleasant thought, for it is a warning that England is not the England of old times—the "Merry England" of which poets write, but an England which worships brute *force*.

The expulsion of the Jesuits by Bismarck is not merely the expulsion of a number of men—it is the expulsion of a *great principle*; —it is the declaration of war against *the principle* for which the Jesuits live and die. This it is which has made the years 1872 and 1873 the beginning of a new era in the history of Christianity.

To agree with the expulsion of the Jesuits is to sanction, tacitly, the reason for which they are exiled; therefore, if the English press represents the opinion of the English nation, we condemn that great principle which Bismarck condemns. What is that principle? Do the good-natured "John

Why they were Expelled from Germany. 17

Bulls," who so implicitly believe in Printing-house-square, think about it, or do they act on impulse? We shall see.

The principle for which the Jesuits have so often shed their blood freely—for which they now are banished as criminals from Germany, is contained in one brief sentence spoken by Jesus Christ: "*Render to Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's, but unto God the things which be God's.*"

The principle which Bismarck acts upon is as follows:—*The State is in all things, ecclesiastical and civil, the supreme authority.*

In English history, it is usual to praise the Scotch, who resisted a religion which they disliked. It is customary to praise the people who expelled James II. from England. Why is this? Because Englishmen, with only one exception to the rule, will not have a religion forced on them which they do not believe. The Covenanters of Scotland, the Nonconformists of England, are both lauded to the skies because they resisted the *civil power*

when it attempted to force on them religious opinions which they did not believe.

The exception to the rule is the case of Roman Catholics. Englishmen deny them the same right of resisting the Civil Power; while they themselves, as I have shown, do resist it when it clashes with their opinions. When Roman Catholics do the same, it is called "Priestcraft," "Ultramontaniam," "Rebellion!" This is just, liberal, and worthy of the English nation—so very consistent—so very manly and honourable!

But it is the latter principle to which I most wish to draw your attention.

The English nation, by approving Bismarck's action, agree in thinking the State to be in all things, civil and ecclesiastical, the supreme authority.

Firstly. This clashes directly with the great life-teaching and death of Jesus Christ. But I suppose that is no argument for the nineteenth century.

Secondly. Let us follow out this principle,

which is now at work in England, and see the results, past, present, and to come.

If the State is supreme, then the law of the land is the creature of the State. I mean, if the law is founded on the will of the State, it is State-made. Let us consider this. Almighty God gave certain laws to Moses relative to the rights of nations and individuals. He gave Moses the ten Commandments. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, also gave certain laws for the guidance and government of Christians. Were these laws obeyed? The schoolboy even can tell us the persecution suffered by the early Christians on behalf of Christian law. The Christian law often clashed with the laws of the Cæsars, but on that account the Christians did not yield, but died for the law of God, rather than live under the law of man *when opposed to the law of God.*

Bearing this in mind, what do we find in the present day? In the early ages of the Church, the laws of Christian countries were

based on the *law of God*. All laws were not made by the will of the people, but were made in accordance with what God had revealed.

As an example, bigamy was forbidden by Christian law, and so Christian States opposed bigamy. Adultery was likewise forbidden, and also a woman who had committed adultery could not marry again,—therefore Christian States forbade adultery and the marriage of her who was put away for adultery. Thus certain laws were made in accordance with God's law, and were carried out, not to please the people, but because they were of Divine institution. When nations were Christians there could be no opposition between the law of God and man's law, because the latter was based on the former.

But in the nineteenth century we do not find *one single Christian Government in Europe !*

Hence a weighty question has arisen. What is to be done if a nation, a Govern-

Why they were Expelled from Germany. 21

ment, wish to impose as law that which is opposed to Divine law? This is the question between Church and State;—this it is which is making Bismarck expel the Jesuits.

In England we have Jews in Parliament; we have a nation, many of whom oppose the law of God; and what is the result? It is simply this: The law of the land has ceased to be based on the law of God. There are no longer certain laws enforced because they are God's laws. The law of the land permits the remarriage of a woman who has committed adultery and been divorced for that crime. This is directly opposed to God's law. So here the Catholic Church and the State are in direct opposition!

The Church clings to God's law rather than man's law, when the two are in opposition. Formerly, when laws were founded on the Divine law, there was a high code of justice which could not be altered; but

on what is law now based, when it has ceased to be founded on the law of God? On mere force, on mere brute force!! This is what a nation comes to that rejects God's law. I will exemplify it. If there is no Divine law, there is left simply human law; if human law, then law made only by men; if made only by men, then liable to be changed whenever those who make it change their minds. We have many examples of this. Mr. Gladstone, when Mr. Miall wanted to disestablish the Protestant Church, replied that the country *was not ready for it!!* Mr. Miall goes away and says to his friends, "Agitate, agitate! Mr. Gladstone will make any new law when the country is *ready for it!!*" Good God! what next? What a principle whereon to govern! There is no longer a right and wrong—no longer a law which is just and a law which is unjust, but the law is, whatever a sufficiently powerful mob may desire. Agitate! agitate! yea, agitate! Let but a

sufficient mob be aroused, and I, Gladstone, will do away with the House of Lords, with the rights of property, with capital punishment, with religion — with Jesus Christ!! O, yes, anything, only let the country be ready for it.

Yes, my dear reader, such is the chaos to which legislation is reduced in this nineteenth century. Such is the result of having a non-Christian Government, non-Christian law. At present the respectable Englishman may not mind the lengths to which the mob rule, but this legislation based on *force* will not stop. Already universal suffrage looms in the distance, already a godless, brutal, animal working class (I do not speak of agricultural labourers), whose whole desire is to confiscate the wealth of their betters and to gratify their passions, is gaining strength, and will ere long give new laws to England. And what laws? Have I not sufficiently shown you that a godless government and nation, a godless law, will infallibly

lead to anarchy? It is to oppose this, to base law on the law of God, to govern *the souls of men* by the Divine law, the law of love personified, that the Ultramontane priests, as they are called, will not submit to mob law, or heathen morality, even when taught by intellectual Germany. The Jesuits are but following the steps of their Divine Lord and Master, and, unheard, untried, they are banished from their country, which they so ardently love, and long to save from that godless rule and mob government which, when two aged men, Bismarck and William, go to their reward, will then uprise.

Mob rule or Ultramontane rule — one or the other, there is no third choice.

I do not appeal for fair play to the Jesuits merely for the sake of "justice," because that is useless. The words of the Bishop of Orleans well apply to England. He said lately, "Would the English press employ towards the deadliest foe of England, or the worst government on earth, the insults and

Why they were Expelled from Germany. 25

calumnies it heaps every day on the Pope? No ; for these brawlers are as humble to the strong as they are overbearing to the weak. They think twice before they remonstrate with Russia, entreat Germany not to dislike them, and beg the United States to accept a few millions and an apology. You know how to bend your proud head, alter your tone, and lower your voice, when you are in presence of a power that can look you in the face."

Do I now require to answer the question, "Why the Jesuits were expelled from Germany?" The answer is simple: Because they did not wish to give up God's law for mob law, for the devil's law of anarchy.



HOW THE JESUITS FARED IN PRUSSIA ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

ANY person who takes up an American newspaper will at once become aware of the enormous number of Germans who are daily and hourly leaving their fatherland for America. These men are, many of them, well-to-do tradesmen and small farmers; men who have not sought a foreign land because grim poverty stares them in the face at home. Why is it that the "exodus" has begun? Why do so many thousands leave that proud "*Vaterland*" for a foreign shore? It is because they love their faith and their God more than aught else in this world; it is because Germany has become an arena of religious strife, of religious persecution and

oppression. Germany is rent in twain by religious discord, and that on the accomplishment of a war which left her victorious over a most powerful enemy. Hardly had peace been declared between Germany and France, ere Bismarck at once throws down the brand of discord by enacting penal laws against the Jesuits. What infatuation can have seized him? When he might have made a united Germany, and raised the power of the nation to a greater height of prosperity than ever before, he at once takes the very step which of all others is most likely, in a few years, to break up an empire newly founded, and as yet but in its birth. Bismarck has accused the Jesuits of "treason;" has stated that the laws now passed against them were passed in self-protection against men who sought to undermine the new empire. Vain excuse—base lie! There is no private soldier in any one German regiment that has not seen the Jesuit in the late war, in the very front of battle, consoling the

dying man by Christian rites, regardless of shot and shell. It seems, indeed, as if the Spirit of Evil must have made a tool of the Chancellor ; for how otherwise account for so impolitic, so heathen a revenge for the services of the Jesuits but two years ago !

The object of these pages is to bring before the public a record of how another king in the last century acted towards the Jesuits when they were ill-treated and banished from several European states.

Frederick II., King of Prussia, knew the work of the Jesuits quite as well as the present William, whose fulsome piety during the late war was an occasion of disgust and laughter to all sensible men. He was the patron of Voltaire, the friend of free-thought, and consequently cannot be accused of favouring the Jesuits because he agreed with them.

will lay before my readers a brief account of his view of the Jesuits, his treatment of them, when a popular clamour drove them

out of their homes in various lands. By contrasting the opinion and the example of the infidel King of Prussia with the Christian German Emperor, a result not favourable to the latter will be shown.

The nineteenth century declares that the Jesuits ought to be put down because they are **THE ENEMIES OF FREE THOUGHT**. Let Englishmen observe what the king of Free Thought thought of them only one hundred years ago, *how he treated them*. It is a lesson which may open a few minds to the cruelty of the present persecution ; the falseness of the pretext, and the illiberality and oppression which such a course sanctions. The reader who is entirely unacquainted with the history of the period which this chapter treats of can hardly realise the extent to which Europe was excited by religious questions. I do not propose to speak of the state of the various kingdoms ; for I think that the man who is grossly ignorant of history has no right to condemn the Jesuits—he ought first of all to go to school. I

address myself to those who are acquainted with the history of the last century.

On the 19th May, 1769, Cardinal Ganganelli was elected Pope, and was known as Clement XIV.

On the 21st July, 1773, the Pope, who had been unceasingly exhorted and requested to suppress the Society of Jesus, gave in, and affixed his signature to the Brief, *Dominus ac Redemptor*. It must be remembered that a Brief did not bind his successors, whereas a Bull would have done so.

The enemies of the supremacy of the Pope and of the Jesuits were of course delighted with this act, and it will readily be believed how Voltaire must have chuckled, when we know one of his remarks to Helvetius was, "The Jesuits once destroyed, we shall have easy work with *l'infâme*." It is but too well known who it was that he called "*l'infâme*."

It was on the election of Ganganelli that D'Alembert, the friend of Frederick II., thus wrote to the King of Prussia: "It is said that

the Jesuits have but little to hope for from the Franciscan Ganganelli, and that St. Ignatius is likely to be sacrificed by St. Francis of Assissium. It appears to me that the Holy Father, Franciscan though he be, would be acting very foolishly thus to disband his regiment of guards, simply out of complaisance to Catholic princes. To me it appears that this treaty resembles that of the wolves with the sheep, of which the first condition was that the sheep should give up their dogs: it is well known in what position they afterwards found themselves. Be that as it may, it would be strange, Sire, that while their most Christian, most Catholic, most apostolical, and very faithful majesties destroyed the body-guard of the Holy See, your most heretical Majesty should be the only one to retain them."

On the 7th August D'Alembert again wrote to Frederick II. He said: "It is asserted that the Franciscan Pope requires to be much importuned regarding the suppression of the

Jesuits. I am not at all surprised at it. Proposing to a Pope to abolish that brave militia, is like suggesting to your Majesty the disbanding of your favourite guards."

Frederick wrote back to D'Alembert :—

"The philosophy which is encouraged in our day is more loudly proclaimed than ever. What progress has it made? You will reply, We have expelled the Jesuits. I admit it; but I can prove to you, if you so desire it, that it was pride, private revenge, cabals, and, in fact, self-interest, that accomplished the work."

The friend of Voltaire was at all events an honest man; he professed liberality and freedom of thought, and, strange to say, practised it!

On the 7th July, 1770, Frederick wrote as follows to Voltaire :—

"That good Franciscan of the Vatican leaves me my dear Jesuits, who are persecuted everywhere else. I will preserve the precious seed, so as to be able, one day, to

supply it to such as may desire again to cultivate this rare plant."

Voltaire complained to Frederick that the Jesuits who had been banished by Catholic princes were protected by him, who was a heretic and also a philosopher. The monarch replied: "There is not in our country a single learned Catholic except among the Jesuits. We had no one capable of conducting our schools. It was, therefore, necessary either to retain the Jesuits or to allow education to fall into decay."

On the 21st July, 1773, the Pope gave his decision: "Inspired, as we trust, by the Divine Spirit; impelled by the duty of restoring concord to the Church; convinced that the Society of Jesus can no longer effect those purposes for which it was founded; and moved by other reasons of prudence and State policy, which we retain concealed in our own breast, we do extirpate and abolish the Society of Jesus, its offices, houses, and institutions." ("Brief, Dominus ac Redemptor," Continua-

zionede gli annali, tome xxii. part 2, p. 107.) Directly this Brief "Dominus ac Redemptor" was known in Berlin, the philosophical monarch promulgated the following decree:—

"We, Frederick, by the grace of God, King of Prussia, to all and each of our faithful subjects, health.

"You are already aware that you cannot circulate any Bulls or Briefs of the Pope without our permission; we doubt not that you will conform to this general order in the event of the Brief of the Pope ordering the suppression of the Society of Jesus coming to your knowledge; and as at Berlin, on this 6th day of the month, we have resolved, being so moved, that this annihilation of the Society of Jesus, lately decreed, shall not be published in our states, we graciously order you to take necessary measures for the suppression of the said Bull of the Pope; for which purpose you will make in our name, from this time, a direct prohibition, under pain of severe punishment to all ecclesiastics

of the Roman Catholic religion domiciled in your jurisdiction, to publish the said Papal Bull annulling the society. We bid you carefully to carry out this order, and to warn us instantly should any case occur in which foreigners or ecclesiastics shall seek to introduce into the country Bulls of such a nature."

The King of Prussia was not satisfied with this official act ; he took yet another step to prevent the Jesuits being molested in his kingdom. On the 13th September, 1773, he wrote to the Abbé Columbini, his agent at Rome, as follows :—

"Abbé Columbini,—you will inform all who desire to know the fact, but without ostentation or affectation, and you will, moreover, seek an opportunity of signifying the same to the Pope and the chief minister, that, with regard to the Jesuits, I am resolved to retain them in my states. In the treaty of Breslau, I guaranteed the *status quo* of the Catholic religion, and I have never found better priests

in every respect. You will further add that, as I belong to the class of heretics, the Pope cannot relieve me from the obligation of keeping my word, nor from the duty of a king and of an honest man." (*Histoire, &c., par Cretineau-Joly, vol. v. p. 388.*)

This was truly a great lesson for Clement XIV., and produced a wonderful effect in Rome.

D'Alembert was chosen to weaken the blow which Frederick had thus given to the enemies of religion.

The 10th December, 1773, he wrote to Frederick, that "philosophy had been for the moment alarmed at seeing his Majesty sanction such people."

The 7th January, 1774, Frederick answered:—"You need not entertain fears for my personal safety. I have nothing to fear from the Jesuits: the Franciscan, Ganganelli, has pared their claws, and taken out their teeth; and, in fact, treated them in such a way that they can neither scratch

nor bite, but can instruct youth well, for which they are more fit than any one else. These men, it is true, were doubtful in the last war; but, consider the nature of clemency, it is impossible to exercise that admirable virtue unless we have been offended. And you, a philosopher, will not reproach me for treating men with kindness, or forbid that I should exercise justice impartially toward all men, whatever may be their religion or class. Believe me, practise philosophy, and be less metaphysical. Good actions are more advantageous to the public than the most subtle and intricate questions; in which, as a general rule, minds lose themselves without seizing on the truth." (*Œuvres Philosophiques de D'Alembert*, tome xviii.)

D'Alembert was thoroughly out of sorts on seeing the bold line taken by Frederick. The two men are worth studying. The former was proud of being thought a philosopher, one who ridiculed all religion. The other, also a philosopher, but, though utterly op-

posed to Christianity, was yet filled with a real love of liberty of thought, and with a desire that learning should be advanced in his dominions.

Frederick wished his people to receive a liberal education, while D'Alembert would sacrifice the future of the people to his puerile hatred of the Jesuits. Again and again he plied Frederick with arguments to try and persuade him to abandon the Jesuits ; but it was useless. At length, on the 15th May, 1774, Frederick wrote to him as follows :—

“ Could so much malice enter into the heart of a *true* philosopher? So would the poor Jesuits ask, if they knew how you expressed yourself about them in your letter. I did not protect them as long as they were powerful ; in their misfortunes, I only see in them learned men whom it would be difficult to replace to educate the young. It is this precious object which makes them necessary to me, because, amongst all the Catholic clergy

of the country, they alone apply themselves to education, and for this reason I would not give one Jesuit up to anybody." (*Ceuvres Philosophiques de D'Alembert, corres., tome xviii.*)

Two months and a half after this letter to D'Alembert, Frederick wrote the following:—

"They have not made use of the sword in the provinces where I protect them; they have confined their efforts to their colleges in which they teach classics. Would that be a reason for persecuting them? Would people condemn me for not exterminating a society of learned men because some members (supposing the fact true) of this society have committed outrages 200 leagues from my country? The law enforces the punishment of the guilty, but at the same time it opposes that atrocious and blind rage which, in its fury, condemns the guilty and innocent together. Accuse me of too much tolerance: I glory in this defect; it is to be wished that only such faults could

be brought against sovereigns." Verily, Amen, King Frederick! What would he say to the "blind rage" of pious William and Bismarck? We have now sufficiently seen how vainly the infidel school, or, as they called themselves, the Philosophers, tried to alter the determination of Frederick II. to support the Jesuits.

The next attempt was made by the Bourbons, the agents of the Pope; but they were quite as unsuccessful. The Pope thought he might succeed by intimidating the Prussian bishops. He ordered his chargé d'affaires at Warsaw to suspend the Jesuits from performing their priestly acts, and even forbade their teaching. The Apostolic Nuncio at the same time informed the king that this order would cease directly the Papal Brief for the suppression of the Jesuits was received. Catherine of Russia was similarly informed. But both she and Frederick returned the same answer; for in this proposal they at once saw an insidious attempt to dissolve

the colleges placed under their care. They abruptly refused to entertain the idea. The bishops entrenched themselves behind the firm stand made by Frederick; the Bishop of Culm, a bolder man than his confrères, put himself into immediate correspondence with Père Orloski, the Superior of the Prussian Jesuits. This prelate handed over to them the care of his seminary. When this event took place, Frederick and Orloski came to a solemn determination. The king made a public appeal to all the Jesuits; he, *the heretical prince*, invited them to unite together and come and live in his kingdom according to their rule! He allowed to each father a pension of 700 florins. About this time a new Pontiff mounted the throne of Peter. Pius VI. observed with great joy these events, which led the way to the object which he so deeply desired. Frederick also, desirous of totally destroying the wish of some persons to submit to the Brief of Clement XIV., addressed the following letter to the

rector of the College at Breslau (27th September, 1775) :—

“Venerable, Dear, and Faithful Father,—
The new Pontiff having left to my disposal the best means of keeping the Jesuits in my states, and, in order that no irregularity may take place and thus be an obstacle, I have ordered my bishops to leave your institute *in statu quo*, not to restrain in their functions any of its members, nor to refuse ordination to those who present themselves. You will conform yourself to this order, and will inform your brothers of the same.”
(Cretineau-Joly, vol. v. p. 390.)

Thus then it came to pass that the Jesuits found a home in Prussia, a protector in its king. Frederick showed on another occasion his appreciation of the Jesuits. On the 18th November, 1771, the Solomon of the North, as he was called, wrote to Voltaire, who was then on his death-bed. He recalled to him his youthful days and the College of Louis-le-Grand, where he was

educated. "Do you remember," said he, "the Père Tournemine, your nurse (you have sucked with him the sweet milk of the muses). Be reconciled to an Order which has brought you up, and which in the last century has given to France men of the greatest learning." (*Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, tome xlvi. p. 302.)

Here I will close the dealings of Frederick with the Jesuits. They show us a king who was not ashamed of being just *for justice sake*; who submitted to the laughter of his infidel friends, and the dislike of his brother princes, because he knew himself *that the Jesuits were maligned and unjustly condemned*. It is customary for Englishmen, when speaking with those who support the Jesuits, to say, "Oh, yes, that is all very fine, but history tells us how bad they were." To such men I would say, "Who is more likely to know the true character and action of the Jesuits than a king who thought so highly of them that, contrary to the example and wish of his

neighbours, he not only gave them a home in his kingdom, but paid every priest belonging to the society in his land !”

I have, I think, sufficiently shown how differently the Jesuits fared in Prussia in 1773 from what they do in 1873. If any one reader closes this book with the conclusion, “Well, Frederick was no fool; perhaps the Jesuits are not so bad as they are painted,” I shall be well rewarded for writing it. No Englishman would expect a Fenian to give a fair description of England, so neither would an honest Englishman seek only in a *hostile Press* for information about the Jesuits.



PERSECUTION OF THE JESUITS IN ENGLAND.

LIKE to come across the easy-going English Catholic, and tell him that ere many years are over we shall be treated to a dose of religious persecution. He smiles placidly as he assures me that the day is over for religious persecution,—that Englishmen “go in” for liberty of conscience, and so there is nothing to fear. I like to hear him, because such an innocent babe must needs, by his very disposition, be, humanly speaking, sure of heaven. Temptations or doubts can never make any headway with such a man. But, seriously, it is a most momentous question which I am going to ask. It is, “Have we any security against having, in a year or

two, religious persecution of the Jesuits in England?" Not one atom!

The Jesuits have already been expelled from Germany, and as I now write (February, 1874) there are distinct signs that Austria cannot stem the Prussian onslaught on the Order; she is preparing for a general expulsion likewise. Here, then, is the consequence. The Jesuits must go somewhere; America will take many of them; but pure necessity must send large numbers into England and Ireland. At once, or very shortly, that tyrant Bismarck will use his too great power and influence, and we shall see the "Times" and the old woman, the "Standard," first suggest, then agitate, then demand that England shall not be overrun with those cursed Jesuits. Do you, my Catholic or Protestant reader, imagine for one minute that if an agitation once assumes any importance we shall hear of "Liberty of Conscience." Bosh! Do you think Disraeli can afford to alienate the Protestant vote? Are you so simple as to

suppose that the Democratic or Liberal party in England will, to oppose the Conservatives, take the side of Liberty? No! The Liberal party as a Whig party is no more. The two parties are now the Conservatives and the Democratic bodies. Democracy goes in for secular education, and 'so Democracy will, from their point of view, side with any man who can aid in expelling the very vanguard of the army of *religious* education.

Austria, and Prussia, and Russia will all work together, and coward England will humbly follow in their steps.

Don't call me an alarmist. I once knew Carl Marx, the Internationalist leader, and he gave me an insight into what "liberty of conscience" means in Democratic mouths. Well, what are we going to do in these not very far distant days? Are we prepared to make a strong, united League, and to say, "In God's name let us fight for our God and His Church—First we are *Catholics*, secondly *Patriots*."

I know I shall be told by many, "You must not invoke the 'arm of flesh.'"

If so, I have read the history of England and of Europe to small advantage. England will only for one reason avoid persecuting the Jesuits, and that is through — *fear*.

If she fears, she will give in. Make England fear a united body of Catholics; let her know that we fall together; that we will resist persecution even to the death; and England will *hesitate* as to the advisability of creating a civil war, which will rouse the whole of Ireland from north to south, which will call to our aid some millions of our American Catholics, and make the beginning of a European religious war. If we don't act unitedly *when* the time comes, we shall find English Catholics treated like their German brethren. First the Jesuits, but then every *regular priest* of any order whatsoever. Then State inspectors of "candidates for the priesthood," &c.

In Germany the persecution began with

the Jesuits, in England the story will be the same.

What English Protestant does not honour the Covenanters of Scotland? My Catholic friend, why? You know the answer. Because they resisted persecution and suffered death to win religious liberty for themselves. Forewarned, Forearmed.



ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS DISLOYAL?

YOU are an Englishman, and believe in God. This being so, be honest for a minute, and think on what I am going to say.

May I cut your throat? No. Why? Because if you do you will be hung. Why? Because the law forbids a man to kill another. Why? Because God forbids murder.

May I marry a woman who has been divorced for adultery? Yes. Why? Because the law says so. Why? Because Parliament, in accordance with the wish of the people, passed a few years ago a law to allow it. Did God allow it? No. (St. Matthew v. 32, "Whosoever shall marry her that is

divorced committeth adultery." St. Mark, x. 12, "If a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery.")

Then the law hangs a man who commits murder because God tells us that it is to be done, and the law does not punish a man who marries a woman who has been divorced for adultery, because although God forbids it yet the law of the land allows it? Yes. Then the law is sometimes opposed to what God wishes? It seems so. Are you a Christian? Yes. Do you think it is right to obey man rather than God? No.

Then if a number of Christian men obey God's law rather than man's, when the two are in opposition, you would obey God's law with them, and disobey the law of the land? Yes. Then you don't consider it would always be disloyal for a man to disobey the laws of his country? Not always, because if my country passed Acts which were against what God tells us to do, I would then obey

God rather than man. You would? Yes. You really mean this? Yes, of course I do! Then please, next time you read or hear of Roman Catholics being disloyal, because they put God and the Church before man and the law, remember what you have just acknowledged to me.

Try and be consistent. You say that God's law is above man's law, and that is just what Roman Catholics say in Germany and Ireland, and why they are persecuted and called *disloyal*.



THE POPE AND LIBERTY.

IN Spain, some years ago, Isabella was Queen. There arose a rebellion which was so successful that she fled, and a new ruler was chosen. The "Times" during the struggle called her opponents the "Rebels;" but, when they succeeded *a few days later on*, they called her party the "Rebels." This is one example of a common fact, and that fact is, that when a ruler of a nation is opposed by some of his subjects—those subjects are by the "Times" called "Rebels;" but when those subjects have overthrown their ruler, then *they* are the Government, and the king's followers are forthwith "Rebels."

To bring this home to our own land. Let the Fenians rise against Queen Victoria and

they are "Rebels;" but according to the "Times" and the nineteenth century idea of right and wrong, let them *succeed*, and forthwith the Queen's followers are "Rebels" and the Fenians the lawful rulers. History within the last fifty years gives so many examples of this, that nobody can be foolhardy enough to dispute the fact that, in this age, MIGHT IS RIGHT. Let one part of a nation rise against another, and they are called "Rebels;" but let them *succeed* in their rebellion and their former rulers are forthwith called "Rebels." No man can controvert this statement. I will deduce a few interesting conclusions therefrom. If success is always justifiable and failure treasonable, then no man can condemn the Communists for rising against their own countrymen and trying to burn Paris. They were not wrong in what they wished, they were only wrong *because they did not succeed*. As with the morality of a nation as a nation, so with individuals. The thief may plead as follows:—The English

Government and nation always acknowledge revolutionists abroad *when they succeed*; ergo, if I, an individual revolutionist, transfer money belonging to another man to my pocket and am not caught, why then, having succeeded, I am according to English ideas a *successful* revolutionist and so worthy of praise.

The swindling banker who is arrested, and by his deeds brings misery to many a home, is no longer to be condemned for *a sin* committed; he is to be condemned because he did not *succeed* in making off without being caught.

These deductions *are not forced*—they are logically deduced from the political morality now accepted in England.

Bismarck in Germany confiscates the property of the Jesuits; Victor Emmanuel does the same in Rome; and because they have brute force on their side, *and succeed*, therefore the English press applauds them. Wherein lies the error which is at the root of this evil?

It is that the action of God on the world is denied. A "theft" is no longer wrong because it is in God's sight a sin, and therefore Christian people condemn the thief, because he has broken *God's law*; but men condemn him because he has broken a law simply State-made, simply passed because necessary as a *safeguard for society*.

So with Governments. Acts of Parliament bear witness to a statement which is only considered *Antiquarian*, but which formerly had a meaning attached to it. I allude to the following: "Victoria, by the grace of God," &c. This implies that kings and governments derive their power from—God. Admit this old principle, and then this false system. I have spoken of disappears. If kings rule by God's grace, then so long as they keep God's law pure and unstained, so long as the king acts lawfully and as in God's sight, revolution is *sinful*, not because it may not succeed, but it is, *per se*, in and by itself, a *sinful act*.

There are no longer Christian governments, and hardly a Christian nation; hence it is that Europe is quivering under the attacks of Revolutionists, Communists, Socialists, and Infidels. Hence no nation feels secure, no king can reckon on his reign being undisturbed by rebellion. This has all sprung from modern times having turned God out of the State, out of the School, out of the University. God's action on the world is denied. The remedy is simple. If kings desire to reign securely, if governments desire to be undisturbed by anarchy, if the rights of property are to be respected, then the voice of God must again be heard in the affairs of nations and men. The Pope, as God's representative and ambassador on earth, is the fountain of justice.

History shows that when kings and nations were Christian, the Popes were the safeguards of property, of kings, of all that men value. Till men acknowledge that God rules on earth as well as in heaven, till they obey

the voice of His representative on earth, there will be chaos, revolution, and anarchy.

Anarchy and revolution are opposed to liberty; true liberty can only exist in God-founded, God-governed states, and this is quite natural. Why should the poor, the weak, the miserable, be taken care of—if there be no God? If the world is Fatherless, then SELF is supreme—if SELF is supreme, then FAREWELL TO LIBERTY.



PROTESTANTISM.

TO be a Protestant means that the person who uses that designation protests against something or other. The word in itself does not show what the man who uses it believes. It does show us that there is something which he does *not* believe. In this age the word is used only in a religious sense ; it is the name by which those Christians in the West of Europe, who dislike or disagree with the Roman Catholic Church, call themselves. Any thoughtful person will perceive at once that the word conveys no impression as to what a man does believe. For example : a Unitarian is a Protestant ; that is, he belongs to the *genus* Protestant, *species* Unitarian ; and, as a Unitarian, he

does not believe that Jesus Christ is God. A Baptist, who does believe that Christ is God, calls himself a Protestant. So it is evident that a Protestant need not be a believer in the divinity of Jesus Christ. What then must a man believe in order that he may call himself a Protestant? He must believe that the Roman Catholic Church is not a divinely appointed Church, is not divinely guided, that it is a Church which is in error.

What is the foundation on which all disbelievers in Rome base their faith? It is on the Bible. The Bible is to all intents the religion of Protestants. The question requires to be asked, "What is the history of the Bible?"

To speak plainly and simply, it is very much as follows:—Some of the earliest teachers of Christianity, such as St. Paul, St. Luke, and St. Peter, wrote various accounts of events in the life and work and teaching of Jesus Christ. These writings, with others written by Clement and certain devout Chris-

tians, were kept by those to whom they were written or by whom they were valued; and, as writing was laborious and printing unknown, of course they were considered great treasures. After one or two hundred years these numerous epistles were sorted and examined, and some of them were declared to be *inspired* writings; while others, which were previously thought to be of equal value, were declared to be merely human compositions, not written under *Divine* guidance. Some local Churches rejected books we nineteenth century Christians hold to be inspired, as the Book of Revelation, which the Council of Laodicea would not accept. After many differences and frequent councils, the books now known as forming the New Testament were selected from many others as being "inspired" writings. When printing was discovered, these writings were copied and circulated far and wide, and were finally, as the art progressed, bound together in one cover, and called the "New Testament."

Two questions will here come uppermost in our minds. Firstly, what do Protestants mean by the phrase, "inspired writings"? Secondly, how did those men who separated books now considered inspired from those not inspired, know that they were right—that they made no mistake—that they did not say that certain writings were inspired which were not so—that they did not say certain writings were not inspired which were inspired?

To begin with the word "inspiration." Dr. Johnson propounds it to mean "*the infusion of ideas into the mind by a superior power.*"

Dr. Webster, in his "Dictionary of the English Language," defines inspiration as "*the supernatural influence of the Spirit of God on the human mind, by which prophets, apostles, and sacred writers were qualified to set forth Divine truth without any mixture of error.*"

Those two great men differed in their opinion of the value of the word in a religious

sense. Webster claims "*protection from error*;" Johnson and Richardson omit anything of the kind.

It is a fact, known to any very moderately-read man, that those bishops and doctors of the Church who stated that certain manuscripts written by certain apostles and evangelists were "inspired," never at any time declared what they meant when they declared them to be "inspired." It is evident that Drs. Webster and Johnson have arrived at no settled meaning of the word "inspired." Seeing this is so, it is as well to inquire what theologians usually mean by the term "inspiration." There are two great schools, widely differing from each other as to what "inspiration of Scripture" means. It is stated by the one party, that the writers of those epistles and gospels, which, bound together, are called the "New Testament," were so infallibly guided by the Holy Spirit, that every word, even syllable, was written under the direct and immediate

influence of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Dorner, in his well-known work, "History of Protestant Theology," alludes to this class of thinkers when he observes: "Thus Holy Scripture became itself revelation, and not merely the *record* of a revelation previously given." (Vol. ii. p. 128.) Calovius in his "Syst. loc. Theol.," tom i. cap. 4, speaks of the writers of Holy Scripture as, "Dei amanuenses, Christi, manus et spr. S. tabelliones et notarii." This school of thought considers that "inspiration" has regard to the words as well as matter, a view to which, according to Dorner, the theory of Buxtorf was necessary. The other school had many distinguished men, among whom Rathmann held a front place. He was much opposed to the above view of inspiration. In his opinion it put fellowship with the impersonal Scriptures in the place of the fellowship with the living God.

As the majority of Englishmen belong nominally to the Church of England, it may be well to state that neither the Prayer-Book

or Thirty-nine Articles define the meaning of "inspiration" in connection with Scripture.

The sixth article says: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be *proved thereby*, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." This states that all necessary articles of faith are *contained* (only observe, *contained*) in the Bible. It is evident that Scripture is not *verbally* inspired; but lest any one should think this an assertion without proof, it may be well to put the question as follows: "If every word of Scripture is inspired *directly* by the Holy Spirit, we have the exact, actual, literal words of Jesus Christ." I would ask such a believer to compare the following:—

PROTESTANT VERSION.

ST. MATTHEW.

Jesus. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word *that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.*"

ST. LUKE.

Jesus. "That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God."

ST. MATTHEW.

Satan. "All *these things* will I give Thee, if thou wilt *fall down* and worship me."

ST. LUKE.

Satan. "All *this power* will I give thee, *and the glory of them*; for that is delivered unto me, and to *whomsoever I will*, I give it. If thou, therefore, wilt worship me, all *shall be thine*."

"MacNaught, on Inspiration," in alluding to the discrepancies here shown, writes: "This dialogue shows that the two Evangelists, both professing to give the 'ipsissima verba' of Jesus and of Satan, not only vary the expressions of the dialogue, but either Matthew omits, or Luke adds, the important idea in Satan's last speech, that the powers of the world had been delivered to Satan, and to whomsoever he would he gave them. Apart, then, from the order of arranging the temptations, there are discrepancies of word and thought in this dialogue, which forbid our believing the records of both Matthew and Luke to be free from all error. Which Evangelist may be the more correct, it is not for us to say; but whichever of them be in

error, as one certainly must be, the idea of inspirational infallibility is rendered alike untenable."

I will now give two rather long quotations, which, since they are to the point, I feel no hesitation in giving at length.

Mr. Baring-Gould is an Anglican clergyman and known in the literary world. In the "Origin and Development of Religious Belief," p. 135, he says: "Scripture makes no claim to be considered as a book. It is a fascis, not a rod; neither does it claim, in whole or in part, to be inspired. The writer of the third Gospel plainly speaks of his undertaking as suggested by like undertakings on the part of many others; he thinks himself justified, as well as they, in 'compiling his narrative' ἀναρτᾶσθαι διήγησιν, by reason of the opportunities he had, referring obviously to human opportunities. He does not claim to be inspired, to have had a revelation, nor even a knowledge of the facts at first hand. There is one passage, which is

repeatedly quoted as conclusive for Bible authority, and that is 2 Tim. iii. 16: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction,' etc. But the important word in this sentence, on which the proof depends, is by no means certain. It rests on the authority of some MSS. codices, but not on all; and the real meaning of the passage seems to be: Every sacred writing given by inspiration of God is profitable for teaching, etc.; and we are left in the dark as to what writings are inspired, and as to the extent to which inspiration goes. We call Dante and Shakespeare inspired, and their writings may be also applied with authority to teaching, reproof, and correction, if that text be our sole guide.

"If the Scriptural infallibility doctrine be true, the Bible ought to contain an inspired catalogue of the Sacred Writings, and a statement of the limits by which inspiration was bounded. An authorised copy ought

also to have been preserved, that all might know exactly what the words are of which Holy Scripture consists. But, on the contrary, the canon of Scripture was not settled till late; some of the works now contained within its covers were rejected by some Churches and received by others, and certain works received by some Churches have been cast out of the canon.

“On what authority, except that of the printer, do men claim inspiration for ‘Solomon’s Song,’ and refuse it to the ‘Book of Wisdom’? Why are the Epistles of St. Paul quoted as canonical, and the Epistle of his fellow-labourer, St. Barnabas, rejected? There is not a single original of any of the Old or New Testament writings. We possess copies only, made by men who had no claim to infallibility, which do not agree together, and in some places are at variance, so that it is impossible to pronounce with certainty what is the original and correct text of any book. If the Divine Spirit prevented the

authors of our Scriptures from falling into any error, surely it was leaving the work incomplete, if those infallible writings were left to the inaccuracy or carelessness of copyists. It is well known that the Puritan Divine, Dr. Owen, clung with desperation to the theory of the antiquity and inspiration of the Hebrew punctuation as the only safeguard for the certainty of the sense. We know that in India, the most scrupulous care has been taken to preserve every word of the Vedas, its true signification, and its pronunciation: and treatises, called Vêdangas, were composed to the number of six, to preserve the Vedas in all their purity. . . . Nothing of the sort supplements the Christian Scriptures; but if the infallibilist theory be the true one, some such guarantees become morally essential."

Mr. Baring-Gould also states that "the Church, though she has used Scripture as a mine, has never defined inspiration, nor has she ever affirmed that the Bible is inspired" (p. 366).

Before quoting my other authority (John Henry Newman), I will here bring in the second question I asked. The first one was, What is meant by "Inspiration;" which I have gone into, and its kindred phrase, "Infallibility of Scripture"? The second question is, "How did those who separated books now considered inspired from others not inspired, know they were right? that they made no mistake? that they did not say certain writings were 'inspired' which were not so? that they did not say certain writings were not inspired, which were inspired?" In "Discussions and Arguments," page 203, by Dr. Newman, there is a good deal said which is valuable in connection with my second question. Speaking of the difficulties of the canon, he writes: "Be it so. Well, how will the same captious spirit treat the sacred canon? In just the same way. It will begin thus: 'These many writings are put together in one book. What makes them one? Who put them together?

The printer. The books of Scripture have been printed together for many centuries. But that does not make them one. What authority had those who put them together to do so? What authority to put just so many books, neither more or less? When were they first so put together? On what authority do we leave out the Wisdom or the Song of Sirach, and insert the Book of Esther? Catalogues certainly are given of these books in early times, but not exactly the same books are enumerated in all.' The language of St. Austin ('De Doctr. Christ.,' ii. 18) is favourable to the admission of the Apocrypha. The Latin Church anciently left out the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Eastern Church left out the Book of Revelation. This so-called canon did not exist at earliest till the fourth century, between two and three hundred years after St. John's death."

These questions are, I conceive, not to be answered by the Protestant; for, be it

remembered, Protestantism rests its belief simply and solely on the Bible, without believing in the infallible judgment of the bishops who decided what books were and what were not to form the canon. I have gone into the Bible argument because it is the sole authority of Protestants. I have, I hope, shown briefly and clearly, first, that the Church of England does *not* know, nor does any person know, what is meant by "Inspiration of Scripture." Protestants, as regards the foundation of their belief, are in the same predicament as the Indians, who, when asked on what foundation the world stood, answered that it was carried on an elephant, and the elephant on a tortoise ; but there they stopped short, for as to what the tortoise was carried on never entered their heads. There is something very grand in this illogical Bible-worship. The author of "The Divine Teacher" (p. 37) well says: "I have a great affection, and in a manner a reverence, for those Bible-Chris-

tians, as they are called, and for this reason: True, they worship they know not what; it is an irrational worship. It is, if you please, something akin to Fetish worship, or to the worship by the Ephesians of their goddess Diana, who fell down to them out of heaven from Jupiter. But with all these drawbacks, it is the nearest approach to an act of faith which is or can be made out of the Catholic and Roman Church. There is a *submission* of reason and will to *something divine, as divine.*"

In parting with this subject, I will give one reason why Bible-worship by itself is most dangerous. It is because the New Testament does not plainly and *distinctly* prove the Divinity of Jesus Christ. It is well that I should state what is meant by the Divinity of Christ; it is not so well known as may be supposed. In the words of Canon Liddon (Preface to second edition of "Our Lord's Divinity"): "The great question of the day is, whether Christ our Lord

is only the author and founder of a religion, of which another Being, altogether separate from Him, namely, God, is the object; or whether Jesus Christ Himself, true God and true man, is, with the Father and Holy Ghost, the object of Christian faith and love as truly as, in history, He was the founder of Christendom. . . . It is really a choice between a phantom and a reality, between the implied falsehood and the eternal truth of Christianity, between the interest which may cling to a discredited and evanescent memory of the past, and the worship of a living, ever-present, and Immaculate Redeemer."

Dr. Newman is revered as a profound theologian all over the world. He writes ("Scripture and the Creed," p. 184): "The first three Gospels contain no declaration of our Lord's Divinity, and there are passages which tend at first sight the other way." Again (p. 113): "A person who denies the Apostolical Succession of the ministry, be-

cause it is not clearly taught in Scripture; ought, I conceive, if consistent, to deny the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, which is nowhere literally stated in Scripture." Mr. Baring-Gould, in the work before mentioned, on page 139, says: "When we come to examine the Gospels, to discover what testimony they bear to the Divinity of Christ, we find them singularly deficient. The first three have not a passage on this point, nor a single word identifying Jesus with God, or calling Him God."

When two such eminent persons can publish works containing these statements, and with perfect truth, can we wonder if those who accept the "Bible only" become Unitarians or Deists?

A religion which consists in looking at the past cannot live in our day. Protestantism is effete, worn-out, a skeleton. To use the words of an author before quoted: "Protestantism is a religion of looking back to the past, not a religion of the present.

Two thousand years ago Christ was in His Church, and we are two thousand years off from Him."

"The history of religion," says a modern essayist, "according to the ordinary Protestant view, is an immense anti-climax. Judaism is a half-success, Christianity is a climax."



ANGLICANISM.

PROTESTANTISM is a religion made up of negations, in contradistinction to Roman Catholicism, which is a positive system. The Protestant says: "I don't believe," &c.; the Roman Catholic says: "Credo."

Anglicanism partakes of both the Protestant negative system and the Catholic affirmative. As Macaulay, the historian, has expressed it: "With one hand she touches Geneva, with the other, Rome."

A man may call himself, and be recognised as, a Protestant, and yet deny that Jesus Christ is God. Now there is one great truth plainly laid down in the formularies and Articles of the Anglican Church, and that

truth is the doctrine of the blessed Trinity. No man can conscientiously be an Anglican, and deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. These are the only doctrines on which the Church of England speaks in a bold and unmistakable manner. It may at first sight seem curious that a Church with such wealth, such supposed learning, and with Thirty-nine Articles, should not teach any other truth in a positive manner. The reason why this is so, is because the Church of England is a "*compromise*." When, in the reign of Henry VIII., the Church gave up the Supremacy of the Pope in matters of religion, she forthwith became only a *local* Church, the Church of the English people; and not as the Roman Church, of which before it was a part, a Catholic or Universal Church, independent of territorial boundaries.

Being henceforth a local Church, and as a consequent fact the tool of the State, she was made to teach only such a modicum of

truth as should suit the rulers at that time, and give *no trouble to the State*. In Germany, Döllinger and his friends have given up the authority of the Pope, and their whole idea has since been to gain favour with Bismarck and the German State. A dogmatic Church may often be a very disagreeable companion to an unbelieving Government; hence the only positive doctrines insisted on were the "Divinity of Christ" and the "Trinity."

I will justify my remarks as to a "Government religion," by quoting from Dr. Newman. He, when writing of "English Jealousy of Law," observes:—"What makes me think that this is the real meaning of a jury, is what has lately taken place in a parallel way in the Committee of Privy Council on the Baptismal controversy. My Lords refused to go into the question of the truth of the doctrine in dispute, or into the meaning of the language used in the Prayer-Book; they merely asserted that a certain neutral reading of that language, by which it would

bear contrary senses, was more congenial with the existing and traditional sentiments of the English people. They felt profoundly that it would never do to have the Church of the nation at variance in opinion with the nation itself. In other words, neither does English law seek justice, nor English religion seek truth, as ultimate and simple ends, *but such a justice and such a truth as may not be inconsistent with the interests of a large conservation.*" Some things were affirmed and others condemned by the Thirty-nine Articles besides the two I have mentioned; but the language was so vague in which the Articles were written, that any doctrine could find a home there. This is proved most plainly of late years by Privy Council judgments. The Privy Council has had to decide what construction is to be put on various doctrines as expressed in Prayer-Book and Articles. The Gorham judgment showed the vagueness of the formularies of the Church of England on the Baptismal

Regeneration question. The Bennett judgment, on the Holy Communion, was given in a similar spirit. The result of every judgment being—that the doctrine to be decided on is invariably left vague, and neither condemned or affirmed. Whence it is evident that the Church of England is most rapidly ceasing to be a *teaching* Church.

It is nothing but a preaching Church at present. Dr. Littledale, in the "Contemporary Review" for December, 1871, points out the difference between teaching and preaching in a very clear manner. He says: — "In strictness, the preacher is a herald sent out by authority to proclaim a new edict, which it is necessary to make widely public; and in this sense the Gospel can be preached only to persons hitherto ignorant of its existence. Once they have listened to the proclamation, and have in any measure signified their willingness to accept it, the office of the *preacher* is ended, and that of the *teacher* begins, to explain,

amplify, and show the practical application of the New Law — its bearings on the thoughts, words, and actions of those whom it affects." Besides the fear the Government had of an "*Imperium in Imperio*," there was a historical reason for the vagueness of the formularies of the Anglican Church. It must be remembered that as the Anglican Church was to be the *National Church*, it was necessary to open its portals to as many minds as possible. Thus the Puritan element had to be soothed; and so, on the other hand, a door was to be opened for any Catholics who might be inclined to conform. Hence the "comprehensiveness," as a certain well-known Anglican bishop* calls it; or, as I think would be a more true and honest phrase, the "*latitudinarianism*" of Anglicanism.

I have spoken thus of the Anglican Church as a body. This Church is established, and thus recognised as a State Church. There are

* The late Bishop Wilberforce.

the two separate bodies—Church *and* State, neither mixed together, but both united; and so long as this unity lasts, the English Church will be the National Church. But in this Church there are three large parties, each holding contrary views to the other, and each tries to force the other out of the *Establishment*. These bodies remain in the same Church only because it is Established; and, because Established, the State will never give a judicial sentence condemnatory of any doctrine held by these parties. But once let the Church become disestablished, and forthwith, instead of having three bodies working together, kept together by the State, you will have three Churches or sects, each of the sects being also divided and subdivided into innumerable smaller sects. The names of these three bodies thus tied together by the Establishment are the “High Church,” “Low Church,” and “Broad Church.”

The High and Broad Churches are in the ascendant. The Low Church, being ultra-

Protestant, has ceased to be manly or intellectual, and, like Protestantism in Germany, is dying out with the men of the last generation, the rising generation being semi-infidel, or, in a more or less degree, Catholics or semi-Catholics.

The High Church party is a historical party. It declares the necessity of having a regularly episcopally ordained priesthood; and, of course, believes in apostolical succession. It is an *antiquarian* Church. For it believes that the Church of Christ became divided and corrupt about the sixth century, and that since then, Christ has not left any infallible guide in the Christian Church. That the Holy Spirit preserved the Church from false teaching till the great division, when the Eastern Church, in the time of Photius, separated from Rome; that since then, the Church being divided, the Holy Spirit no longer has stayed with any local Church, and not with the whole Church, since that whole is divided; and therefore the High Church-

man holds that all great councils and all creeds adopted and held previous to the schism were inspired, and thus *infallibly* true; and that from that time till now the visible Church has ceased to be one, and has ceased to be *divinely* guided.

The High party contend that the Reformation was a mistake; they simply wish to deny Papal Infallibility, and to hold the doctrines believed prior to this schism of Photius.

It is evident that at the Reformation the Anglican Church made for herself thoroughly Protestant "Articles;" and, since the doctrines held prior to that event were then expunged, this expunging was equivalent to denying their truth. Invocation of saints and prayers for the dead have been "omitted" from the Prayer-Book now in use, as also the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.

High Churchmen believe in the above doctrines; and hence it is that they are strongly bent on obtaining a more "Catholic" Prayer-Book, and a reintroduction of the teaching of

dogmas believed previous to the Photian division. The dissatisfaction with the Anglican Church *as it is*, had led Father Humphrey, in his clever pamphlet, "The Divine Teacher" (p. 42), to explain the difference between Anglicans and Roman Catholics as follows:—"The difference between a Catholic and a High Churchman comes to this—the Catholic is *taught by his Church*, the High Churchman tries to *teach his Church*."

It is evident that if High Churchmen desire and long for a dogmatic Church, they must seek a *new* Reformation founded on *different principles* from the last, or else leave their Church for another. Dr. Pusey, in a letter to the "Times" of 22nd August, 1872, says, speaking of the Athanasian Creed:—"In like way, those in whose name I write, sir, to you, think that to withdraw the *only declaration which the Church of England has in her public services*, that the belief in the Catholic faith is necessary to salvation in those who can have it," etc.

The head of the High Church party thus gives to the world the opinion of his party, that a true faith is not, according to the English Church, *an essential*; and the Athanasian Creed which is used by that Church is the only document which states that it is so. This surely is a proof that, as I stated before, the Church of England *has ceased to be a teacher of religion*. The Athanasian Creed was not accepted by any of those Councils received by Anglicans, so that it cannot be rightly and logically *quoted by Anglicans in defence of dogmatic truth*.

The Bennett judgment, as I before stated, is another proof of this want of positive truth; and in concluding this portion of my subject, I will quote the opinion of the "Spectator" on that judgment as bearing on the question I am discussing:—"No party in the Church can possibly lose so much intellectually by mere toleration on precisely the same level with other parties which deny and even denounce its principles, as that which lays its

very foundation in the principle of *dogmatic authority*, and insists on unity and universality of doctrine as the principal 'notes' of a true Church. A little more persecution, or the dread of it, would be infinitely more to its advantage. Yet this toleration, and this only, is the kind of recognition which the High Church party, represented by Mr. Bennett, has gained from the judgment. It has gained the right to be left alone,—so far at least as its Transubstantiationist tendencies are concerned,—but it has gained that right only at the cost of consenting to keep its dogmatic genius to itself, and to subsist, like other parties in the Church of less pretension, on that principle of private judgment which so ill accords with its fundamental view."

It may be asked: On what basis does the Anglican High Church party take its stand?

It is not on the Divine authority of a *living* Church; it is not that it believes in a revelation given to the Anglican Church;

but it is that it believes a revelation *was* given to what is called the Primitive Church; thus they hold their doctrines because they believe that they know by *tradition* what that Revelation taught the Church in ages long past. The High party may of course in this way hold doctrines revealed to the Church long ago without any claim to Divine guidance in the matter. They can find from history, which is *written* tradition, what was held in certain ages of the Church; for such only was the primeval mode of knowing things. Thus, in "Hints and Facts on the Origin of Man," by Dr. Melia, p. 59, quoted by Lord Arundell of Wardour, in his work on "Tradition," the following interesting facts are given:—"Considering the great length of the life of the first patriarchs, Moses must have had every information through non-interrupted tradition. If we reflect that Shem for many years saw Methuselah, a contemporary of Adam, and that Shem himself lived to the time of Abraham, . . . that Abraham died

after the birth of Jacob, and that Jacob saw many who were alive when Moses was born, we see that a few generations connect Moses, not only with Noah, but also with Adam." This extract shows how, apart from revelation, truths may be known and handed on by tradition.

Anglicans may hold certain dogmas as true, because they think the dogmas true; not because their present Church to which they belong *teaches them as true*. This is why I call the High Church party an *Anti-quarian* body.

Next in order comes the Broad Church party. They have no definite views like the High Church party. They are strong upholders of the Establishment, and are generally considered indifferent as to what the State Church teaches. They are implicit believers in the doctrine of "Comprehension." This springs, of course, from the knowledge that they have no definite views, and so are callous as to what doctrines are

omitted from the formularies of their Church. They do not believe in the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, nor in the Sacramental system; and it is popularly thought that many do not believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ. They look on the Anglican clergy as a sort of "moral police." In one word, they care very little for doctrines, and they think "morality" everything. This of course leaves it open for a man to say, "What, do they not believe in a Revelation?" The only answer I can make is: If a Revelation *has* been given, surely there must be dogmatic teaching; yet they lay but little value on such; at least, their works do not show it.

The Low Church party is essentially a Protestant body, and as such has been discussed under the head "Protestantism." The Low Church belongs to an Episcopal Church, which is the National Church; but they do not believe that Episcopacy is essential or necessary; they believe in the "Bible only."

The "Guardian" is the leading newspaper belonging to the English Church. In an article of that paper, I find as harsh a view taken of the Church of England, as it exists at present, as could be penned by its most determined opponent. It is as follows:—
"We agree with Mr. Shipley that the Church's relations with the State are bad, are becoming worse, and may at any time become intolerable. Whether as an Establishment or as a Church, we have danger on all sides. Without—to say nothing of the avowedly infidel party which is growing in numbers, weight, courage, coherency, and popular estimation—there is one powerful and numerous combination which is labouring for religious equality, and that the Establishment may be subverted; another, active and educated, which is labouring for the suppression of theology, and that the Establishment may be de-religionised. Within we are divided and leaderless. It is difficult to say what may or may not be taught in our pulpits—as

it is difficult to expel from clerical office scandalous moral offenders. Our compelled anarchy results in an alarming amount of personal weakness—despotism, frivolousness and insubordination, with a fantastic idolising of each man's crotchets, and on each side the two extremes of magnifying differences and of denying that anything is worth believing. The Church appears like an unskilful swimmer, buffeting, or rather buffeted by, waves and currents, and eddies, just able to prevent sinking, with little hope of determining his own course, or choosing whether he shall be cast out safe on dry land, or swept away into the open sea.”—(*Guardian*, Oct. 2, 1872.)



ROMANISM.

NOTHING is so talked of in what is erroneously called the "Religious World," as Romanism; and, I may say, nothing is so little understood. The head, the life of the Roman Catholic Church, is the Pope. The Roman Catholic believes that Jesus Christ founded a Church which would last till He came again at the end of time to judge all men, the living and the dead. He believes that as Jesus Christ prayed to His Father, that His Church might remain one, that that Father who is Almighty will fulfil His prayer. "That they may be one, even as *we are one*." He believes that the Holy Ghost will always preserve the Church from

falling into error; he believes this because Jesus Christ said that after He left this world He would send the Comforter, who would "guide her into all truth."

There is one great fundamental difference between the belief of the Anglican and the Roman Catholic; and in one sense, *the* great difference. The Anglican believes in certain doctrines because he thinks they are *in themselves true*. The Hermesian doctrine in the University of Bonn was similar to the Anglican idea. "Hermes, it is true, recognised the tenets of the Church, not, however, on account of their being taught by the Church, but because he had arrived at similar conclusions in the course of his philosophical researches" (Menzels' History of Germany, vol. iii., Prussia and Rome). The Roman Catholic believes in doctrines, not only because he thinks the doctrines are in and by themselves true, but because he believes in his Church, and consequently accepts all his Church propounds to

be believed. Dr. Newman on this subject observes ("Grammar of Assent," page 240, third edition): "A man is converted to the Catholic Church from his admiration of its religious system, and his disgust with Protestantism. That admiration remains; but, after a time, he leaves his new faith, perhaps returns to his old. The reason, if we may conjecture, may sometimes be this: he has never believed in the Church's infallibility; in her doctrinal truth he has believed, but in her infallibility, he has not. He was asked, before he was received, whether he held those particular doctrines 'which at that time the Church in matter of fact formally taught;' whereas it really meant, 'whatever the Church then or at any future time should teach.' Thus, he never had the indispensable and elementary faith of a Catholic, and was simply no object for reception into the fold of the Church. This being the case, when the Immaculate Conception is defined, he feels that it is something more than he bargained

for when he became a Catholic, and accordingly he gives up his religious profession. The world will say that he has lost his certitude of the divinity of the Catholic faith, but he never had it." Dr. Newman is supported by the well-known philosopher, the Protestant Bishop Berkeley, who has remarked: "It is not simply believing even a Popish tenet, or tenets, that makes a Papist, but believing on the Pope's authority" (*Life and Letters of Bishop Berkeley*, p. 270, by A. C. Fraser. Oxford, 1871).

The English press, and in fact the whole press of Europe, would have it believed that the "Infallibility of the Pope" is a new doctrine, first taught by the Vatican Council. It is really nothing of the sort. The doctrine has always been believed by Roman Catholics; but before the Vatican Council it was not made "de fide," viz., an article of faith.

This is quite easily proved to be in accordance with the history of the enunciation of other doctrines. For instance, it was always

true of the Holy Ghost that "*He proceeded from the Father and the Son,*" but such was not taught as "*de fide*" till some hundreds of years after the Church was founded. So in like manner, because Papal Infallibility was not declared till a certain time to be "*of faith,*" that is no proof of the newness or falseness of the doctrine.

High Anglicans constantly say, "Rome has added to and corrupted the faith, let us consult the early Fathers, and then we shall be safe."

Bishop Hefele in his "History of the Christian Councils" (Clark's translation, p. 233), observes: "The stability and permanence of the doctrine of the Church on the one side, and the uncertainty of several of the Fathers in expressing the doctrine of the Logos on the other, were pointed out long ago by S. Augustine" (on Ps. liv., lv., n. 22), and S. Jerome (adv. libr. Rufin. ii. 440, ed. Migne). S. Augustine says: "*Num quid perfecte de Trinitate disputatum est, antequam oblatrarent Ariani?*"

This uncertainty of the Fathers has been pointed out with still greater force by Petavius. With Petavius agree Prudentius Maran (*Divinitas Domini nostri J. Christi manifesta in Scripturis et Traditione*, Paris, 1746, fol.; and *La Divinité de notre Seigneur*, etc., Paris, 1751), and Möhler (*Athanasius*, i. 116, 56).

I cannot, in a short essay for general readers, go more fully into this interesting question; I must pass on, having given a hint which students may examine and amplify for themselves. I have sufficiently shown that it is not absolutely necessary to appeal to the "Fathers" on matters of doctrine, unless a powerful weapon is to be put into the hands of Arians.

It may be as well to give a few authorities to prove that the supreme power of the Popes is no new doctrine. Philip, Legate to the Pope, at the great Œcumenical Council held at Ephesus, A.D. 431, in the midst of the bishops there assembled, began his confirma-

tion of the condemnation of Nestorius in the following language (Hard. Act. Concil. T. I. col., 1478):—"No one doubts, nay, it is known through all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of the apostles, column of the faith, and *foundation of the Catholic Church*, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, and there was given to the same the power of loosing and binding sins; who up to this time without intermission, and always, lives and exercises the office of a judge (*judicium exercet*) in his successors." Again, St. Eucherius, A.D. 445, writes:—"He commits the lambs to him, then the sheep, because He makes him not pastor only, but *pastor of pastors*. Peter therefore feeds lambs and sheep, feeds children and mothers, rules both subjects and prelates." (Hom. in Vig. SS. Pet. et Paul.) St. Nilus also (Lib. ii. Ep. 75, A.D. 430, ed. Leon. Allat.) says that the Lord, after consoling the penitent heart of Peter, "consti-

tuted him the shepherd of the whole world."

(ποιμένα τῆς οἰκουμένης χαθιστησιν.)

I have taken the three above quotations because they occur in writings of what is called the "Primitive Church." I am indebted to Mr. Rhodes's work on "The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church" for them (vol. i. p. 57, et passim). There is another very popular idea, and that is, that Papal Infallibility is a *blasphemous* dogma! Why? People say—it is making the Pope a God.

Why?

The Vatican Council simply has declared that the Pope at certain times, when doing certain things, is infallibly guided. Why is this blasphemous? why does it make him like unto a God? Was not St. John infallibly guided while writing his Gospel? Must not the twelve apostles have been guided and prevented from teaching error; or else, might they not have taught falsehoods to the heathen whom they were sent to convert?

It is very curious to observe how High

Churchmen, when discussing this question, become as bitter as the most ultra-Protestant and Pope-hater. They are very absurd in being so bitter, and for this reason, because the arguments used by themselves against Papal Infallibility can easily be turned against them. The High party believe that an Œcumenical Council held in those days when the Western Church and the Eastern were not divided, was infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost from promulgating error. The Roman Catholic, logically and with perfect right, can turn against his High Church accuser and say:—"If the Holy Ghost can preserve three hundred bishops in council from teaching error, cannot the same Holy Spirit guide *one* man as easily? If one is blasphemous, so is the other. Both claim supernatural aid; and with that aid *all things are possible*.

With religious writers of the Protestant religion it is customary to storm against individual Roman dogmas. This is a great mistake; it is far more reasonable to attempt

to destroy *the foundation whereon all is built up*. The infallibility of the Pope is the foundation-stone of "Romanism;" and if that foundation were destroyed, the whole building *raised thereon* would fall to pieces. Since this Vatican Council, many members of the Roman Church have left her. Dr. Döllinger and his fellow-thinkers, called Alt-Catholics, are a specimen of these people. For myself, I must confess their position seems utterly untenable. A split with Rome surely should include a split with all which Rome has built up. Such is not the programme of the Alt-Catholic Protestants. They quarrel with the Vatican definition of Papal Infallibility; they do not quarrel with dogmas which for hundreds of years have rested on Papal proclamations.

There has been no better surgical operation on the Alt-Catholic community than that contained in a pamphlet entitled "Letter to Döllinger from a Layman in Moscow of the Russian Orthodox Church. Berlin, 1872."

This work is reviewed in the "Guardian" of 17th July, 1872. From it I quote the following:—

"The title of the *brochure* is 'Letter to Döllinger from a Layman in Moscow of the Russian Orthodox Church. Berlin, 1872.'

"The writer opens his subject by expressing the deep interest with which the Russian Church views the struggle which troubles the Church peace of the Germanic people. This Church stands outside the strife, and, strong in her unbroken tradition, takes the *high historic* ground, regarding with calmness the war which convulses Popedom. Long ago she gave the warning that Romanism was travelling to its ruin, and now that her warning is accomplished, she can gather up the facts judicially and impartially. When she looks from her security on the Western world, she sees on the one side Popery, which in the stead of the unworldly Church of Christ has set up—

" 'A worldly empire, belonging to the world

and time, a spiritual, absolute Monarchy with an autocrat, the Pope, who despotically rules the conscience, and therefore annihilates freedom, the very essence of faith.'

"On the other side she sees the—

"'Self-created, ragged faith of Protestantism, unable on the unstable foundation of individual thought and conscience to keep its ground against the active assaults of Rationalism.'"

"These opposite errors had culminated at the period of the greatest abuse of the age, the Vatican Council :—

"'When Pius IX. summoned his sons from all sides to a pretended Ecumenical Council, we considered the calling of this Council to be the beginning of God's judgment on the Roman Church. We were confident that this Council must be the swan's song of Romanism, its latest utterance, its logical development driven to absurdity, before whose crying folly the mind and conscience of every one must recoil. At that same time,

there rang in our ears the noisy cry—Away with the faith, away with the Church! And whence sounded this cry? Was it not the voice of the most admired leaders of the people, of the representatives of intelligence, of the combatants for political freedom, for the rights of reason and conscience, for the dearest interests of humanity? Between the Church, as understood in the West, and humanity, a fierce strife seemed to have arisen. The idea of faith (as it is now exemplified in the Roman Catholic world) had become synonymous with the idea of tyranny, and the negation of faith with the idea of freedom. Rome is judged by her own works: out of the deification of the Pope sprang godlessness, out of misbelief unbelief, and so the Western world has split into two hostile camps. On one side we see positive religion with its sublime Church constitution, and under her banner narrowness, darkness, oppression, slavery, the needs of the spirit mistaken, the holiest rights of man denied; on the other

side unbelief with its watchword, freedom and progress, unrestraint in life and morals, and at the same time with *its* hostile, deadly negation, with *its* compulsion and rebellion, with *its* unsatisfying claims on the spirit.'

"Eastern Christians began to ask what the end of all this was to be? in what way the 'beam of faith and truth could break through such spiritual darkness?' The feeble protest of a Latin bishop or two before and at the Council was seen to be useless, as it was only covering old lies with new ones. But at last, the declaration of Döllinger broke through the gloom, and gave assurance that the strength of faith had not quite left the Western world. His declaration was such as strongly commended itself to the Eastern mind, based as it was on Church history and tradition, a ground which it was perceived, before the Munich Congress laid it down, must lead to the right acknowledgment and due appreciation of the position of Oriental Christianity.

“The Roman Council came to an end, the Pope triumphed; his infallibility and universal supremacy were declared. It was reasonable to expect that the protesting bishops would now take the lead of those who set up the rights of conscience against the Roman bondage; but all yielded, denied themselves and the truth, and became servants of lies. Alone Döllinger remained firm, and though none of the ‘Church princes’ joined him, and the mass of the people remained neutral, yet his name became a watchword for all who ‘would not make their faith an empty sound, nor betray their conscience.’ Then the Munich Congress placed the movement in a new and most important stage; its programme puts forth the hope of reunion with the Greek Oriental and Russian Church. We welcome this hope in a loving spirit, and in pursuance of our duty strive to remove all hindrances. As a first step, it is necessary to be plain as to our views of the movement, and our idea of your position.

“First, your name. You call yourself ‘Old Catholic’—that is, one who does not receive the dogma of Papal Infallibility, or, in other words, ‘the Catholic who does not acknowledge the Council of 1870 is an Old Catholic: he who does accept the Council is a New Catholic.’ The question suggests itself naturally—‘Is the old really old, is the new really new?’ Seventeen years ago, Pope Pius IX. proclaimed, without any council at all, ‘the deification of the Virgin Mary in her Immaculate Conception.’ No protest was then heard against it, even from those who now call themselves Old Catholics. Was not this general consent just as much a virtual acknowledgment of Papal Supremacy as this Vatican Council? It follows that, ‘for seventeen years the Old Catholics have *de facto* acknowledged what the New Catholics continue to accept, and what the Old now refuse *de jure* to receive.’ You must therefore go farther back with your claim of ‘Oldness,’ and indeed you have done so in your Munich

programme, wherein you reject all the new dogmas of Pius IX., and take your stand on the so-called Council of Trent. 'Thus with one stroke of the pen you write out *three hundred years of the life of the Roman Catholic Church, and for this whole period cut off the tradition of the Church.*' What else indeed could you do? No single act of your Church for this time contradicts the confession of the Council of 1870; these three hundred years belong to the New Catholics, not to you. So you go back to the Tridentine Council. But is this a firm basis for those who declare, as you do, that you rely on '*the unity of the old undivided Church, on her past, on the teaching of the Fathers and Councils before the separation*'? Is not this Council the fullest denial of that teaching? Was the Eastern Church represented at it? Has she ever acknowledged it? Does not its Creed contain the *Filioque*, as great a novelty as the *Papal Infallibility*? If you condemn the addition of new dogmas at the Vatican Council, as being contradic-

tory to the 'teaching of the undivided Church,' you must be logical and condemn the *Filioque of the Tridentine Creed as well*. And if you do condemn novel additions to the faith which the Council of Trent authorised, your standpoint on that Council is not good for much.

"But looking at the matter in another light, your rejection of Papal supremacy is inconsistent with the Creed of Trent. All the conciliar decrees were published subject to the reservation of the rights of the Holy See — 'Omnia et singula sub quibuscunque clausulis et verbis . . . ita decreta fuisse, ut in his salva semper autoritas sedis apostolicæ et sit et esse intelligatur.' *Could any new Catholic put the Papal authority higher than this?* It is expressly put above the authority of Councils. There is no stand here for the denier of the supremacy of the Pope: you must go farther back than Trent. How far? *Will the Council of Florence do, which proclaimed the Pope 'totius Ecclesiæ caput et*

omnium Christianorum Doctor' ? and which held the Papal *sanction* indispensable for the *validity* of its *decrees* ? Who undermined the Catholic unity, and split Christendom into two parts ? Innocent I. and Gregory VII., or Adrian II. and Nicolas, by their claims to universal power ? Surely the Old Catholic who founds his faith on the doctrine of the Romish Church of the *second half of the ninth century* has no ground for *rejecting the dogmas of Pius IX.* The whole history of the Romish Church for the *one thousand years since the schism* has been a *perfect logical development of its doctrine of Papal authority.* 'Popery' has been its living organic principle. The Popery of the ninth century and the nineteenth, the Popery of the Middle Ages, are one and the same tradition ; the New Catholics believe nothing new : they are perfectly consistent to the Latin Creed of one thousand years. But you, Old Catholics, must go back before this time for your 'old' catholicity.

“Why do the Old Catholics attack the present Pope? What is he in comparison with Innocent and Gregory, and other giants of Popedom? Is there no lesson to be learnt from the fact that Papal infallibility has been promulgated under one who is gentleness personified? ‘This repulsive product of the most repulsive Satanic pride’ is put forth under ‘the most virtuous and true-hearted Pope that has lived since the separation.’ *It is the system, and not the man.* Pius IX. is the medium, not of his own idea, but of the historic idea of the Papacy in its present form; the dogma is but the formulated statement of the mass of lies which for one thousand years has been gathering round Popery. You say in your programme that you strive after a reform which ‘shall remove in the spirit of the old Church the present defects and misuses.’ Is the infallibility of the Pope only a defect? Is the deification of the Pope simply a misuse? Are they not falsehoods? Are they not a development of the organic

errors of the Romish Church, summed up in the word 'Popery'? Is it possible that you can stop where you are? Rejecting the newer dogmas, can you still believe the Pope to be the representative of a so-called Church deposit, which can give indulgences for sin out of a treasure of the works of saints? Can you still acknowledge a *Reserve Fund of Grace*, at the sole and absolute disposal of the Pope? It is impossible; having begun, you cannot stop without eliminating from your system all that is *distinctively* Papal; you must reject all which, through this Papal principle, has been imported into the spirit and life of the Roman Church. You do really go so far as this when you say in your programme—'We hold fast to the old constitution of the Church,' and when you appeal to the consent of 'the Fathers and Councils of the old undivided Church.'

"But then, while you do this and reject that which is the whole essence of Popery, *you deny the Pope's right to excommunicate you*

from his Church, and condemn his exclusion as baseless. Is this consistent? You disown the Papacy, and yet will not break loose from the Church of which it is *the life*. Is there any Church fellowship or *unity of faith* between you? You do not believe what Rome teaches. And if you disown Rome, her excommunications should be *welcomed*, not rejected, for you must see that you cannot remain with her when the differences of faith are so great. 'No, you are outside the Church, outside that Church which calls itself Roman Catholic, whose head is the Romish Pontifex, and whose outward organisation is *complete*. You are outside of her, just as she, the Church, is outside of you. This the old Catholics must proclaim plainly and unmistakably, for in this declaration alone lies their justification, and their right to hope for communion with any Church which does not stand in *communion* with Rome.'

"So you do not belong to the Roman Church: you say you are not going to make a Church

for yourself, and yet you claim to be regarded as a 'full member of the Catholic Church.' To which Church, then, do you belong? *What do you mean by the 'Catholic Church'?* Do you mean merely 'that local Church or Christian congregation which has borne for centuries the name Roman Catholic, and has fashioned the Roman Patriarchate? Or that one, holy, Catholic-Apostolic Church, as it is called in the Nicene Creed, whose Head is Christ (not the Pope), and which has preserved and kept the faith of the Saviour and of the apostles undefiled'? If you say you belong to the latter, then you cannot be a member of the Roman Catholic Church, whose doctrine you declare to be contradictory 'to the Scripture, to the tradition and confession of the old undivided Church.'

"Your answer will be:—'Truly we stand outside the present Roman Church which recognises the deification of the Pope, but we are one with that Roman Catholic Church which preserves the Creed of the old, universal

Church.' *But there is no such Roman Catholic Church in existence, nor has such a community existed for the last thousand years. Do you believe, according to the statement of Christ, in a visible Church which contains and ministers the Sacraments of grace? But your Church is not a visible or earthly one. You cannot be contented in your present position. It would be at any rate conceivable by us, if you went to the State with these words: — 'We have severed ourselves in our creed from the Romish Church, and have relinquished its communion; we wish to establish a Christian community of our own, and demand from you the acknowledgment of our civil right and freedom of conscience and worship.'* But that you should demand, as you seem to do, from the State rights under the name of fellowship with a Church, to which in the unity of faith you no longer belong, *is very hard to conceive.*

"One or the other: either Papal Infallibility is a matter of no especial importance, at

least, such as to justify separation from a Church that upholds it, or your quarrel is with the *very principles* of the Church itself. One would think that your idea of the Church was more of an outward corporation than an inward confederation, something like that of a society whose members are only to be known by certain outward conventional marks. We can hardly wonder at such an idea; it has its *raison d'être* in the teaching and practice of the Roman Church. Rome, having altered a Creed and arrogated to herself exclusive sanctity and power, necessarily perfected her system of outward authority, together with the inward slavery of conscience and a merely conventional consent. What does Rome mean by the Church? *Only those who submit to the Pope.* A Russian writer, Chomakoff, describes the Latin Church after the separation as 'a spiritual Roman Empire, which later split off into a Protestant Republic.' Bishop Maret gives as his description of the Church—'*L'église est une monarche*

pontificale, tempérée par l'aristocratic épiscopale.' Is not the possibility of such a definition enough to condemn the Roman Church and to justify the stand of the Orientals? And from this idea you are not yet emancipated. How often in the Munich Congress the debate ran, not on the inner conception of the Church, not on her organic utility, but on her outward reorganisation, 'on democratic principles.' Monarchy—aristocracy—democracy! How strangely these words sound, as describing a Church whose kingdom is not of this world, and of which it is written that in her 'is neither bond nor free, but all are one in Christ.' How strangely they sound to the Eastern Christian, who holds that clergy and laity alike are bound in one common bond of love and reverence to their common mother, the Church. But we see how the teaching of Rome for a thousand years has led up to this, and we can try to understand how you cling to outward connection with Rome, while denying her teaching, and at the same time

hope to have communion with the Eastern Church, the Church of Utrecht, and the Protestant bodies.

“The Utrecht Church is just in the same position as you ; it rejects the Pope and holds to the Pope ; it splits off in doctrine from Rome, and is anxious to maintain communion with Rome. In 1858 Chomakoff wrote to the Archbishop of Utrecht: ‘A Church without a head you turn to a schismatical head, with the request to adapt himself to your constitution, and to give you that fulness of life which you need.’ Then the Protestant communities,—it sounds strange to hear them called ‘Churches,’—how can you, who cling to ‘unbroken tradition and the doctrine of the Councils,’ join with Protestants who reject both ? You say you hope for this understanding, ‘on the ground of *Science* and of *progressive Christian culture*.’ Science and intelligence we prize highly, but they are not the same as Divine truth ; and then, what becomes of the masses who *possess neither science nor*

culture? Will you make your future Church *only an aristocratic corporation?*

“Where and with whom then are you ‘Old Catholics’? You have no firm standpoint. ‘You do not stand; you stagger. You are on the way, but on a cross-road.’ You profess to stand with those who hold to the tradition, doctrine, and faith of the old undivided universal Church. Where do you find any period of the life of the Roman Church since the schism that answers to this? No Church in the West can claim this character; the Eastern Church alone can make it her rightful boast.

“There are these ways open to you. 1. You can go back, give up your protest, deny yourself, and join the Church of the Pope. That you will not do. 2. You can join the Lutherans or Reformed, and ‘enter on the slippery path of Protestantism.’ Or 3. You can build a local Church. If the latter, then consider, where do you get your bishops? They are consecrated by the Pope. Do you regard the Sacrament of Orders as a merely

mechanical transmission of the gift of the Holy Spirit? Must there be no community of faith between the ordaining Church and the ordained? And if a Bishop severs himself in faith from the Church of his consecration, has he any right to dispense his gift of grace unless separation is justified by the voice of the universal Church, or at least by some local Church in communion with the universal Church? Moreover, the foundation of an independent local community is an open breach of unity and Church principles, and stands in contradiction to 'the Scripture, the tradition, and the doctrine of the Fathers and Councils.' "

This review is a most complete logical refutation of the position assumed by the Alt-Catholics. There is another point which requires clearing up.

The world in general cannot understand how it is that men who, while at the Vatican Council strongly opposed the proposed definition of the dogma, afterwards sent in their

adhesion. This misunderstanding comes from failing to grasp the idea permanently fixed in the soul of the Catholic. He believes that when the Church promulgates anything as an "Article of Faith," he is bound to accept it. But before such a promulgation takes place he is justified in having his own private opinion on the subject.

There were two celebrated men who were strongly opposed to Papal Infallibility, or, I should more correctly say, to the present definition, as "of faith," of that doctrine. These men were the Père Gratry and the Count de Montalembert. A work has been translated from the French, "The Last Days of Père Gratry:" it is a sequel to "Henri Perreyve," and has been translated into English by a Protestant lady. Père Gratry wrote to one of his fellow-academicians shortly before his death as follows (pp. 45, 46):—

"When the period of polemical strife was opened in the Church I did battle according

to my conscience and my rights. You approved my course, whereat I rejoiced. Now that the decision has come, you will approve of my submission, I feel certain. What would St Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, Fénelon, Bossuet, do, were they yet among us? We should all unhesitatingly affirm that they would not dream for a moment of separation from the Church. And you may be sure that neither have I: if I had, you and my other colleagues would be the first to restrain me.

“I do not wish to enter upon theological ground, but I would just observe that I have withstood the doctrine of *inspired infallibility*, and this the Council rejects. I have fought against the doctrine of *personal infallibility*: the Council decrees *official infallibility*. Writers of a school which I consider extreme were not content with an *ex-cathedrà* infallibility, as being too limited; but the Council decrees it. I dreaded something like a scientific, political, or governing infallibility,

but the Council decrees only that which is doctrinal." (*Vide* Tablet, 6th July, 1872.)

The Count de Montalembert was an opposer of the promulgation of Papal Infallibility. One of his visitors also, only a short time previous to his death, put the following question to him, "If the Infallibility is proclaimed, what will you do?" "I will struggle against it as long as I can," he said; but when the question was repeated, the sufferer raised himself quickly in his chair, with something of his old animation, and turned to his questioner. "What should I do?" he said. "We are always told that the Pope is a father. Eh bien! there are many fathers who demand our adherence to things very far from our inclination and contrary to our ideas. In such a case the son struggles while he can; he tries hard to persuade his father, discusses, talks the matter over with him; but when all is done, when he sees no possibility of succeeding, but receives a distinct refusal, he submits. I shall do the same."

“You will submit so far as form goes,” said the visitor. “You will submit externally. But how will you reconcile that submission with your ideas and convictions?” Still more distinctly and clearly he replied: “I will make no attempt to reconcile them. I will simply submit my will, as has to be done in respect to all the other questions of the faith. I am not a theologian; it is not my part to decide on such matters. And God does not ask me to understand. He asks me to submit my will and intelligence, and I will do so.” “After having made this solemn, though abrupt, confession of faith,” says the witness whom we have quoted, “he added, with a smile: ‘It is simple enough, there is nothing extraordinary in it.’” (*Vide* “Mémorial of Count de Montalembert,” by Mrs. Oliphant, vol. ii. p. 397. Blackwood and Sons.)

This, to the candid thinker, will show how bishops and theologians who, previous to and at the Council, opposed the definition, were

logical, *after* the Council, in accepting its decrees. It is unkind, and not logical, to accuse men who previous to the Council disbelieved or disapproved of the definition, and afterwards submitted, of cowardice or hypocrisy. The Roman Catholic believes that Jesus Christ is a *living* man, and not a God who died eighteen hundred years ago ; their religion is not antiquarian, it is a present living belief in a present living Christ, whose Church is one with Him, and guided by the Holy Ghost. Protestantism is a religion of the past, Catholicism of the present. I will again quote Dr. Newman on this subject ("Grammar of Assent," 3rd ed., p. 44) :—

"Whereas our National form professes to be little more than thus reading the Bible and living a correct life (Dr. Newman is speaking of Protestantism), it is not a religion of persons and things, of acts of faith and of direct devotion, but of sacred scenes and pious sentiments. It has been comparatively careless of Creeds and Catechism, and has

in consequence shown little sense of the need of consistency in the matter of its teaching. Its doctrines are not so much facts as stereotyped aspects of facts, and it is afraid, so to say, of walking round them. It induces its followers to be content with this meagre view of revealed truth, or rather it is suspicious and protests, or is frightened, as if it saw a figure move out of its frame, when our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, or the Holy Apostles, are spoken of as *real beings*, and really such as Scripture implies them to be."

Thus a Roman Catholic believes in a far fuller, nobler degree, in the direct guidance of human affairs by the Blessed Virgin and saints, and, after a Council, would at once accept what was decreed, because believing in a *living* Church, they believe in a living present guide, who directs the Council to promulgate truths and preserves it from error.

Papal infallibility is also very frequently confused in the minds of Englishmen and others with impeccability. The two things

are utterly distinct, and, to the believer in the Bible, can easily be proved to be so. Dr. Newman wrote to "The Times," in September, 1872, on the subject. I will give his letter in full :—

"SIR,—You have lately, in your article on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, thrown down a challenge to us on a most serious subject. I have no claim to speak for my brethren, but I speak in default of better men. No Pope can make evil good. No Pope has any power on these eternal moral principles which God has imprinted on our hearts and consciences. If any Pope at any time has had his mind so occupied with the desirableness of the Church's triumph over her enemies as to be dead to the treacherous and savage acts by which that triumph was achieved, let those who feel disposed, say that in such conduct he acted up to his high office of maintaining justice and showing mercy.

"Craft and cruelty, and whatever is base

and wicked, have a sure Nemesis, and eventually strike the heads of those who are guilty of them. Whether in matter of fact Pope Gregory XIII. had a share in the guilt of the St. Bartholomew Massacre, must be proved to me before I believe it. It is commonly said in his defence that he had an untrue, one-sided account of the matter presented to him, and acted on misinformation. This involves a question of fact, which historians must decide. But, even if they decide against the Pope, his infallibility is in no respect compromised. Infallibility is not impeccability. Even Caiaphas prophesied, and Gregory XIII. was not quite a Caiaphas.

“I am, sir, your obedient servant,

“JOHN H. NEWMAN.”

England is but a small part of the world, and Anglicanism is only an Englishman's religion. It is very comfortable, very vague, and does not trouble its members much, either as to their belief or their practice. So it may do for times of peace, but hardly

for war — hardly when infidelity, and its kindred spirit, revolution, array their ranks in order, and say, using the words of the God of all, “Put thy house in order.”

I will conclude with the words of the “Westminster Review,” which, in an article on the “Difficulties of Protestantism” (p. 71), some months back, compared the two systems: “In a well-known passage of his *Essays*, Lord Macaulay has remarked that it is by no means sure that Roman Catholicism may not be destined to outlive all other ecclesiastical establishments in the world. We think that it is at any rate destined to outlive the system known as Protestantism. Leaving out of consideration its superior antiquity, its unity, its matchless organisation, and other advantages of an external kind, there are two internal characteristics in which it far surpasses its rival. Its promises are more satisfactory to the instincts of the vulgar. The grounds upon which they are based

are, upon the whole, more satisfactory to the instincts of the vulgar, more satisfactory to the mind of the philosopher. On the former point it is unnecessary to enlarge. The Deity who exhibits himself on the altar of every Church is a more immediate Deity than the sublime Being who puts in a momentary appearance in the reign of Augustus and Tiberius. The God who remits sins through the medium of His accredited servants is a more accessible God than the mysterious Spirit of whose pardon and favour none can feel absolutely certain. Whatever benefits a change of creed may confer upon a Roman Catholic, it cannot give him

“‘*Tam præsentes alibi cognoscere Divos.*’

“In the second place, Roman Catholicism is a system very logically reasoned out from certain premises. These, it is true, are only assumptions, but they are assumptions in a great degree common to itself and to its reforming opponents. Whatever may be thought of its axioms and postulates, its

propositions *do* result from them. Protestantism, on the other hand, with far better foundations laid for its edifice, finds itself unable to build in any direction but one, without the risk of seeing the structure crumble to pieces on the heads of the builders. The corner-stone is an admirable one for a temple of Free Thought, and for nothing else. Granting that Almighty God came upon earth to found a religious system, we are at a loss to make out where such a system is to be found if not in the Church of Rome." This review is an infidel one, yet its opinion is valuable as showing the unbiassed view of the non-Christian world.

Englishmen must agree in great part with the above, or else they must say with the learned Le Maistre ("Considerations sur la France," 1797, p. 84):—

"When I consider the general weakening of moral principles, the diversity of opinions, the overthrow of sovereignties which were baseless, the immensity of our needs and

the inanity of our means, it seems to me that every true philosopher must choose between these two hypotheses; either he must form a new religion altogether, or Christianity must be rejuvenated in some extraordinary manner."



THE LATE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER ON THE
HIGH ANGLICAN THEORY OF ŒCUMENE-
NICAL COUNCILS.

THE first practical lesson which they should derive from this view of that first council (Acts xv. 30, 31) was a sense of all that the Church had lost in her great loss of unity; for, however to the eye of God an inward, living, essential unity might and did still survive in the Church—though, blessed be God, they still possessed, in its completeness and purity, the inconceivable gift of His inspired Word—though they had a comprehensive summary of doctrine which came to them, not through Councils, but from the blessed childlike age of faith, before questions had arisen which made it necessary that the

faith should be gathered up into somewhat iron formularies—though all this was true, still, in the loss of visible intercommunion, *the Church had lost the power of evoking at her need the authoritative voice of the indwelling Spirit, of condemning with certain power new things that might be vented among them.* It was true that the blessed Comforter still dwelt with the Church, making her orders real, her absolution valid, her sacraments true means of grace, yet it was true also that *the decision of absolute authority pronouncing upon emergent questions was heard no more,* because that voice of the undivided Church, *through which alone He so speaks,* was drowned in the confused Babel murmuring of discordant utterances. Therefore it was that they dared appeal to the God of truth, and altogether renounce what now professed themselves to be Œcumenical Councils, because these expressed the voice but of a part of the Church, and that often not its purest part, instead of the voice of the whole Church of

Christ in which the Spirit dwelt. It was impossible to calculate completely how great, in many ways, this loss was—how great in preventing strife which troubled them, how great in extinguishing schism which divided them, in removing offences which stumbled so many of their people, and above all, in assisting the Church to convert the world to Christ.

. . . . *The power of evoking the Spirit of God, and its answer upon doubtful questions, was lost more and more as division advanced. By losing unity they lost certainty.* (Italics are, of course, my own.)—*Sermon by Bishop of Winchester at the Church Congress at Leeds: from "Times," of October 14th, 1872.*



A WORD ABOUT RELIGIOUS DIFFICULTIES.

IT is impossible to listen to the conversation which goes on at a dinner party, or in a train, or, in short, wherever two or three men meet together, without hearing opinions the most opposite expressed on religion. The newspapers, which are an index to the mind of the nation, abound with paragraphs about the doings of the various Churches, and so on.

The greatest minds in Europe are occupied with religious questions, and it is religion which is the cause of the acceptance or rejection of the aspirant to a seat in the House of Commons.

Seeing this is so, we must conclude that the religious world is in a queer state, that there

is some reason for this everlasting commotion about the supernatural, for naturally,—

“Religion should extinguish strife,
And make a calm of human life.”

The English belong, as a nation, to the Established Church. Let us first consider the action of that Church on the minds of men, and then we shall see the cause of so many “religious difficulties” laid bare; we shall understand why infidelity is on the increase; and also, I hope I may show how individuals who are inclined to be sceptical, who have “religious difficulties,” must be treated.

A nation is a conglomeration of individuals; therefore I will put before my readers the life of an ordinary common type of Englishman, and see the action of the Church of England on his mind. (Though speaking in the first person, I am not recording any one case in particular.) I am born. So begins my existence. Neighbours congratulate the happy mother who has in her arms a “child of

wrath" — a heathen. The next step in the scene is the baptism of the child. To the ordinary Englishman "baptism" consists in a certain ceremony in a church whereby the little babe gets a name. So I am named or christened. Two godfathers are chosen to see that I am brought up a Christian, my parents, perhaps, not caring much about the matter. I am now in the hands of a nurse. Need I tell the English public that the nurse is generally a woman who fears the devil because of hell, and God because He can send her there? Such is the usual religion of the British nurse. As a little one, I am scolded when I am naughty, and told that the devil will run off with me, or that God will be very angry with me. Constant droppings of water will wear a way into the hardest stone, so likewise a constant reiteration of anything will gradually fix itself in the mind. So I grow up, fearing equally God and the devil. When I am old enough to go to church I see the clergyman, who has often with his wife

dined at my father's house, and smoked and played billiards; and, in fact, made himself comfortable, read prayers, and preached. The former did not affect me much. I heard, for example, at the morning service, "Almighty God, who has safely brought us to the beginning of this day," — at twelve o'clock! Also, "Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee, O Lord," — at three in the afternoon! The sermon was *preached*, not spoken. I could not understand it, so fell asleep.

My Sundays were very dull days, fully sanctioning the doggrel,—

"Of all the days I most do like,
I'm sure it is the Monday,
For that's the day that's farthest off
That dreary blessed Sunday."

I was not allowed to read stories, but was dosed with Bible, Church, and Bible again; made to learn collects and long bits out of the Catechism. I was not allowed to run about and play, nor yet to laugh aloud, but I heard the servants discuss their sweethearts and my parents talk about the neighbourhood,

run down their friends, and otherwise keep holy the Sabbath Day.

I next was sent to school. Need I tell any Englishman what an English school is? It is a place wherein the souls of boys are never sounded, but where knowledge is everything. My masters, who were clergymen, never talked to us about sins which at a boyish age are prevalent. I am sure no time is more valuable wherein to form the minds of the young than between the age of twelve and eighteen, and no time is usually more neglected. Many a boy, the pride of his parents, has, through want of soul-teaching, become a spiritual castaway, and frequently finds an early grave because his parents and masters never told him the evil of boyish temptations, never made him open his heart by loving words, to lead him onwards in the path of virtue. English public schools were, twenty years ago, the devil's own hunting-grounds.

The Sundays at school were as vapid and unreal as at home. The boys were seldom

told by their masters that the spiritual life of the soul needed strengthening as well as the body; they rarely placed plainly before their pupils the duty of receiving the Sacrament. Dry sermons, which usually might have been preached by a moral heathen, did not give me a *love* for God, nor yet did prayers, which were always *preached* and never *prayed*, make much impression on my soul. True it was that Confirmation occasionally took place. That was a grand time. We got out of certain lessons which were hard, for certain moral discourses which were dry. I knew a boy (a fact) who was confirmed twice, and who told me he did it to escape some lessons, and because of a feed we generally got. We were told that Confirmation was the taking upon ourselves our own responsibility, our soul-life in future, relieving our god-parents of their charge. All they ever did for me was, to give me a present sometimes, which I am not aware had any spiritual efficacy. School-life went on, and college-

life loomed in the distance. College is but an advanced school, and the godlessly brought up schoolboy finds opportunities for vice which were not so easily obtained at school. He can drink, gamble, go to races, and other things we need not mention. He may, if he likes, lead a moral life, but no care is taken to see that he does so: so long as he is never caught, he may do what he likes.

When college-life is over you behold a fine specimen of a young heathen Englishman turned out on the world!

I would beg my reader to observe that I am not saying all boys are as I have described, but such are thousands, and such, *for all the training they get*, might all boys be who have been at a large public school and then at Oxford.

The young man has finished his education. Perhaps his people wish him to go "into the Church." In order to do this he has of course a long curriculum of theology to go through? O dear, no! nothing of the sort.

Three months is ample preparation. He must read "Pearson on the Creed," "Browne on the Thirty-nine Articles," "Butler's Analogy," "Book V. of Hooker," and perhaps a little text-book on Church history. If a man knew this, five years ago, and (mark) *had taken his degree*, any bishop would ordain him. He forthwith is to guide, teach, and preach to Englishmen and women—is their spiritual guide! And, oh, what a farce! Yet I know many, many cases of such a life, such a preparation, and such a conclusion.

The young Englishman may, however, not take "orders." He may go into business or take to one of the professions. What is he? He tells you he is a member of the Church of England, and, as much as he is anything, he is so; and he marries and brings up young ones, who also become members of the Church of England. What has been and what will be the effect of the action of the Church of England on the young man I have been describing?

The Church of England, during the three centuries which she has lived through, has not taught *holiness*; she has taught morality. She did not, when she split off from the old tree, the Church of Rome, found nunneries or monasteries, she had for her highest aim simply a life in the world, tintured with religion. The monastic life is the principle of entire self-abnegation; it is also, not simply the denial to oneself of sinful acts, but is the denial of *lawful pleasure*. The Church of England has not in her three hundred years of existence taught that there is a higher life on earth. She has inculcated morality only. With such a basis she started, and so has gone on. The young man will not see around him tokens of the *higher life*, signs of those who have, like the twelve apostles, given up wife and lands and home, for Christ. He will see the teachers of Christianity marrying and making money, and taking good care of themselves; contenting themselves, easing their consciences

by colouring their own lives and their flocks with homœopathic doses of religion. Such is the *general feature* which lies before him. From the minister of religion he will not find *entire* heart worship of God. But let us go on. Men of his own age have, as a general rule, been brought up as he has been. They have been accustomed to Sunday Church-going, and that is all. They go as a custom, not because they love their Church or care one farthing about their clergy as clergy. They find the press treats the Church of England with good-natured disdain. I except the "Standard," which would have to close its office to-morrow were it not for the support of the clerical party, and so supports the clergy and the Church for pecuniary necessity. My readers may say, "You describe true facts, but Ritualism must not be condemned in the same boat." Ritualism, to begin with, is only of a few years' growth. It has not yet a *formulated* creed. And I fearlessly assert

that it is contrary to the mind of the English people. It is a partially developed idea, unauthorised, and, as a rule, repudiated by the bishops of the English Church. Its supporters are women and young men who are not blessed with much logic, and a clergy who have found out that Protestantism is rotten, who dislike submission to Rome, and who, in their spiritual pride, like to be called by their lady friends "Father" this or that.* In numbers it is nowhere. In London and Brighton and a few towns they number some thousands; in the country, a few squires and ladies; but the nation is still Protestant by name, Theist in reality.

I have spoken thus much on the mental growth of the young man and the religious teaching he has received, to show my readers the preparation with which he enters into the battle of life. Can we wonder if infidelity is every day gaining more and more ground?

* I do not deny that there are many holy and able men among the Ritualists; but I speak of them as a whole.

The Church of England has been the cause of this retrogression, by her want of holiness and her departure from the teaching of Jesus Christ.

I have now spoken of the young man thrown on the world. I will turn to another part of my subject.

Within the last thirty years the Church of England has become more and more divided; parties have separated wider and wider from each other, and day by day threaten to break up the Establishment by their feuds. Thoughtful men, with the education I have described, look on the picture and are disgusted. No man lives all his life without a desire to be good. The young man who has been carelessly brought up at length seems to realise the fact that life is short, and that there is a hereafter. What does he do? In the one case he looks around him, sees chaos, says to himself, "What, is there no truth?" and sinks into tenfold indifference. In the other he reads the news-

papers, enjoys the "Saturday Review," and so on, and in fact criticises every form of religion, and finally tells his dearest friends that he really thinks religion is all "bosh," and that he does not think it much matters what a man believes. One religion is as good as another.

These are two large classes of minds generated by the schools I have mentioned, by secular education.

I would wish to give the reason why the latter of these two classes of minds fail to know the truth. I hesitate to do so, but venture because I hope a few may read this who know the truth of what I say, and may benefit by the hint I would give them.

The self-satisfied young man believes in a God. He in his heart knows that God hates sin and loves virtue. This is sufficient for what I want to say. This young man in his search for a creed has not gone the right way to work. He has not "acted up" to the light he has, he has not remembered

the existence of a God ! If he had, he would have said to himself, "I believe in a God : will that God, who loves purity and justice, help me in my search after truth if I am living in a state of sin ?" He will first of all fall down on his knees and confess to God his unworthiness, his waste of precious time, and the little right he has to expect God to lead him into truth. If he does this, then God will give him *grace* to guide him in his inquiry ; and that inquiry, if conducted with prayer and a pure life, will be rewarded. But thousands of young men, who at various periods of their lives desire to know what is the true faith, make two fundamental errors in starting. They first do not give up a sinful course of life, and secondly, they do not ask aid from Heaven. Is it to be wondered at if they fail, and live and die gross Materialists ?

But there is the second class of young men on which some thoughts are necessary. He is not flippant. He does seriously long

for truth, and is willing to confess his errors and misdoings; but seeing the state of chaos around him, he *despairs*, and sinks into mournful or bitter indifference. To him I would make a few suggestions. You wish to know how you can tell where is the true faith? Then consider this: You believe in an Almighty God. You believe that He is the Creator of all things, and that He created all things for His own glory. You read a history which gives an account of the creation of the world, and which is consistent: the same book which gives an account of the Genesis of the world, also gives an account of historical facts which geology and ancient history, by an overwhelming force of evidence, prove to be true. If, then, a book contains forty statements, and you can, by circumstantial evidence, prove eighteen of these statements to be true, then you have excellent grounds for believing that the remainder are true. Thus, then, you will accept Moses' account

of the Creation and fall of man, because you know others of his statements are known to be true by ancient monuments, records, and a number of ancient writers. You learn that God and man were in Paradise in close relationship, and that man walked and talked with God. You learn that man was made with free will, that he might freely love and adore God. You learn that this free will was misused, and that he sinned, and from that moment there was created a chasm (so to speak) between God and man. I need not go through every step in ancient history. The following points will be sufficient: Moses records that a Redeemer from the curse was promised. This we know to be a historical fact as much as we do that there was a person called Julius Cæsar. It was a *universal belief* from the earliest time. Finally, a man was born of a woman, at a time and in a place when, according to the expectation of the Jewish world, the Redeemer should come. This man was Jesus Christ.

In the nineteenth century it is all important that the foundation of belief should be known; that first principles should be ground into people. Here, then, I will ask the young man who reads this, the following: Are you acquainted with any form of religious belief which is or has been *world-wide*, and which is or has been based on a lie? You will most probably say, Yes; but on reflection will have to answer, No. You will, perhaps, mention Mahometanism. It is often mentioned. However, test it by the questions I have asked. Firstly, Is it or has it ever been world-wide? No; to both parts of this question. The revered Dr. Newman answers the question when he says ("Grammar of Assent," 3rd ed., p. 425), speaking of Christianity, "It alone has a definite message addressed to all mankind. As far as I know, the religion of Mahomet has brought into the world no new doctrine whatever, except, indeed, that of its own divine origin; and the character of its teaching is too exact a

reflection of the race, time, place, and climate in which it arose, to admit of its becoming universal. The same objection applies, so far as I know, to the religions of the far East."

Buddhism certainly contains millions and millions of followers, but test it by universality, and it is even less world-wide than Mahometanism is or has been. In point of fact, Christianity is the only creed which is not confined, firstly, to kingdom; secondly, to race; thirdly, to continent. Buddhism and Mahometanism both claim to be a revelation from God to man; but if God has in any way revealed Himself, He must have done so to the world, and not confined His revelation to any corner or part of the world. So then, in reviewing history, we find only *one* faith which is world-wide, and that is the faith of Jesus Christ.

But there is another point equally worthy of observation. Jesus Christ claimed, not only to be sent by God, but to be Himself God. A most plain question must now be

asked by the doubter, and one he has no right to shrink from. He must ask this question : “ Was Jesus Christ an impostor and a liar ? ” He declared He was God. Either He *was* God, or He was an impostor and a liar ! Was His life such that He seemed to be an impostor ? Again, the creed He gave His apostles seemed suitable to all ranks of society and for all people. Besides the Bible, which the sceptic must receive as a historic writing, there are numerous works of the first three centuries, both heathen and Christian, all bearing witness to the fact that the followers of Jesus worshipped Him as God. Mahometanism prospered only by the sword ; Christianity has spread over the whole world simply by virtue of the want it has everywhere supplied. This is the broad ground whereon the doubter must be left. If he fails to accept the enormous weight of evidence in favour of the expectation of the Messiah, His appearance, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, then he must never again believe history. The amount

of circumstantial evidence for the above facts would be sufficient for any English court of law.

I hope I have carried my reader along with me. Let him grant that Christ is God (and if not, then universal Atheism is conceivable), and a few steps only remain ere he can gain a certainty of belief in spite of the clamour of various so-called Christian communities. If Christ is God, then His work, whatever it was, must have been perfect. He declares that all nations are to become Christians, and that He is with His followers for all time ; and not only so, but that the Spirit of God shall guide them and preserve them. Hence it is evident that during His life on earth He only began the work of conversion. He left an organised body to carry on that work till He comes again. Where is that body, or Church ? This is the question. All men in our day, whatever views they hold, call themselves Christians ; but the mere calling oneself a thing does not show that one is such.

I may call myself a king, but I am not one. Well, then, did Christ, who is God, found a Church, or body, or society to carry on His work, or did He not ?

It is reasonable to suppose He did. He says so Himself ; His immediate followers, who saw or heard Him, said He did ; the early Christians all maintain the same statement, that He founded a society which should bear witness to Him, which should be the abode of the Spirit of God, and which should be one with Him, united with Him spiritually, yet really. This again is not a fancy, an idea, or a hypothetical belief ; it is the result of His own words, of the words of His disciples, and of all early history ; so that here again, to apply the old test, if the matter were brought before an English court of law, it would be proved by circumstantial evidence, and also by direct evidence, that Christ left a Church on earth to act for Him till He came again.

Christ is God. If God, then God's work can never fail, or His promises be defeated by

the world or the devil. He stated that His Church should be one, even as He and the Father are One. There is no "getting over" this bold, plain statement. So we know that unity of the most close, supernatural kind was to be one of the conditions of the state of His Church. What Church on earth is *one*? Only one, and that is the Church of Rome. Again, God promised *to be with* His Church always, and that the Holy Spirit should dwell within her. What Church claims divine guidance for itself to the exclusion of all other Churches? Only one Church—the Church of Rome! No sect of any kind claims *infallibility* for itself, and absolute preservation from error, but the Church of Rome. Also, no Church has absolute unity but the Church of Rome.

The Protestant or sceptic who believes that Christ is God need read no more. If he has honestly followed me so far he will have been put on the road which leads to the TRUTH. These two marks of the true Church are suf-

ficient. They point to the one Church and one only. If so far he believes, his next step is to see a priest, to get taught, and then be received into God's own Church, which, being God's, can never deceive or be deceived—else she would be imperfect, which she cannot be, because Christ says He is the head of the Church, and the Church is one with Him.

NOTE I.

Since writing the above I have come across a page which I may well add to what I have written. It occurs in the life of the late Dr. Duncan, Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. It is a conversation between him and a friend. "Tell me," said I (the friend), "what of natural and revealed religion you hold to, that I may know what common ground we have." This appeal had a wonderful effect. He stood stock-still. Then turning round to me with an air of unusual solemnity he said: "David, I must now be plain with you. Time was when I was so sunk in atheism, that once, on seeing a horse, I said to

myself, 'There is no difference between that horse and me.' But Dr. Mearns brought me out of that, and I have never since doubted the existence of a personal, living God. But he convinced me, besides, of the truth of the Bible *as a historical record*. So I have come to believe in the Jewish religion, and in Christianity as the complement of it. But the *doctrines* I can't and I won't believe—I mean the Divinity and Atonement of Christ." "But what if they are written in that Bible which you say you admit? You'll have to believe them. Ay, friend, that towering Luciferian pride of yours must come down, and you must become a little child, willing to be taught, else you have no part in the kingdom of heaven, for Christ your Master says so. But tell me this: what has your religion done for you? I know what mine has done for me; what has yours done for you?"

"Well, not much, I confess. To tell you the truth, the words 'heaven' and 'hell' sound in my ears with as little effect as the

words 'tables' and 'chairs.' And yet I do sometimes feel a little."

"What you *feel* is not the question. What I want you to tell me is, *are you holy?*"

I knew I was here touching a sore place. So, looking him full in the face—the dim light now just sufficient to reveal his cowering look—I awaited his answer.

"No," he replied, "I am not."

"No, nor never will be," I hastily interposed, "so long as God's way of salvation from sin is to such 'Greeks' as you, foolishness; but to us who believe, it is the power of God."

"Ah, David, but that's just what I can't take in yet. Can't I be saved without the *doctrines?*"

"What! are you going to palter at that rate with so solemn a thing as salvation, trying at how cheap a rate—with how small a sacrifice of your own prepossessions—you can be let off? If my apprehensions and experience are worth anything, all that is worth a straw in Christianity lies in 'the doctrines.'"

The man who thus speaks with Dr. Duncan

is Dr. Brown, Professor of Theology at Aberdeen. Both of them, be it observed, are Scotch Presbyterians. Yet Dr. Duncan's mind is well shown to us, and is by no means an uncommon one among Englishmen. Holiness, a requisite, is what I have insisted on as a preparatory step to a right inquiry after truth. Dr. Duncan's life is a way-side confirmation that such is the true course.

NOTE II.

I have observed that Atheism is conceivable if Christ be not God. There is a belief now coming to the front which I may call "Christian Pantheism." Some minds seem to suppose that there is a resting-place between Christianity and Atheism. It may be well to show that there is no such ark of refuge. That Christ or nothing; a fatherless, godless world or a bright heaven above, with a loving Father; one of these must exist: which is true? One or the other. Dr. Newman, describing three classes of men ("Grammar of Assent," 3rd ed. p. 238), writes:—

“ The second became a Unitarian, because proceeding on the principle that Scripture was the rule of faith and that a man’s private judgment was its rule of interpretation ; and, finding that the doctrine of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds did not follow by logical necessity from the text of Scripture, he said to himself, ‘ The Word of God has been made of none effect by the traditions of men ; ’ and therefore nothing was left for him but to profess what he considered primitive Christianity, and to become a Humanitarian. The third gradually subsided into infidelity, because he started with the Protestant dogma that a priesthood was a corruption of the simplicity of the Gospel. First, then, he would protest against the sacrifice of the Mass ; next he gave up baptismal regeneration and the sacramental principle ; then he asked himself whether dogmas were not a restraint on Christian liberty as well as sacraments ; then came the question, what, after all, was the use of teachers of religion ? Why should any

one stand between him and his Maker? After a time it struck him that this obvious question had to be answered by the apostles, as well as by the Anglican clergy; so he came to the conclusion that the true and only revelation of God to man is that which is written on the heart. This did for a time, and he remained a Deist. But then it occurred to him that this inward moral law was there within his breast, whether there was a law or not, and that it was a roundabout way of enforcing that law to say that it came from God, and simply unnecessary, considering it carried with it its own sacred and sovereign authority, as our feelings instinctively testified; and when he turned to look at the physical world around him, he really did not see what scientific proof there was of the being of God at all, and it seemed to him as if all things would go on quite as well as at present, without that hypothesis as with it; so he dropped it, and became a *purus putus* Atheist."



A FEW MINUTES' THOUGHT ON AN
IMPORTANT SUBJECT.

IF I were given £20,000, and told I might invest it in anything which was "safe," I should take great care that I was not deceived ; I should consult persons likely to be well acquainted with investments ; I should weigh the reasons they gave me why such and such an investment was likely to be " safe," and I should not come to a conclusion without considerable thought.

I should also use quite as much care in choosing a legal adviser.

In fact, in all worldly matters of importance I should never act rashly.

There is, however, a subject as important as either of the above, on which men are not

so careful, on which they do not bestow half as much thought, and that subject is, whether the Religious Belief which they profess is "safe:" whether it is based on Truth, or is what I may call "insolvent."

Let me ask you one or two questions. You profess some belief; you may belong to the Church of England, or you may be a Baptist, or Methodist: why do you belong to the religious body after which you name yourself?

You may give me different answers. You may say "My parents belong to this Church, and so I follow their example;" or you may say, "Dr. P. is so very clever, and he belongs to it, so I am content; I don't profess to be learned; what is good enough for him, will do for me."

Let us take these two answers—answers which are often given—and see what they are worth.

I am, however, I should tell you, taking it for granted that my reader is a Christian.

I ask you then to suppose that you and I

had lived in the lifetime of Jesus Christ on earth, and that you were a Jew. I will suppose also that I was a Christian. I should, if I loved you, say to you, "Have you ever thought, dear friend, whether this Prophet, Jesus Christ, may not be the Messiah?"

You would, in answer, say to me, "My father is a Jew; I am not a clever man; Caiaphas is very learned; what is good enough for him is good enough for me; religious controversy is a nuisance, so pray don't bother me about the matter."

I do not think this is an exaggeration of what would have happened had our Lord been born an Englishman, and England had been the land of Jews instead of Palestine. But how, in such a case, could you and I be Christians now in this nineteenth century?

Had all Jews given such an answer, and thought in the way I have said, we can well see that Jesus Christ could never, humanly speaking, have spread belief in His divine authority and mission all over the world.

Let my reader turn then to this country, England, and ask himself if there is not here a very similar case before him. In England there is an Established Church, which possesses *prestige*, wealth, and learning. There are also multitudes of lesser Churches, having fewer followers, but yet possessing wealth and position. There is also in England another religious body, possessing but little wealth, not beloved by the world, despised by the great ones of this world, and putting forward very different claims from either of its richer and more powerful neighbouring religionists.

I will give you some points of contrast between this last mentioned body of Christians and the former ones ; and then a question will come forward which will indeed be worthy of " a few minutes' thought :"—a question which will indeed show us that in our day we must not be content with believing what our fathers believed, *because* they believed it, but that we must, for very shame at least, try and give a reason for the hope that is in us.

The English Established Church does not claim to have been, or to be, guided by the Holy Spirit. She does not claim to be either *the* true Church, or *a* true Church. She is simply a Church which bases her belief on the Bible, and affirms that her Prayer Book, and Thirty-nine Articles, and ecclesiastical organisation, are according to Scripture. The lesser Churches do not pretend to have had a special revelation given them; they, too, in the last few generations, claim to have made for themselves a Church according to Scripture.

But how does the last mentioned Church differ from these? Chiefly in this: she declares that she is founded by Jesus Christ; that she is the Body of Christ; guided *especially* by the Holy Ghost; the only TRUE CHURCH; the very identical Church founded by Jesus Christ; the Ark of God; the Kingdom of God on earth.

She declares that she is from HEAVEN; that she has the gift of miracles; and that

no other Church is a Church at all, but merely a human constitution, utterly alien to God's will, utterly destitute of the 'gifts of the Spirit. What is more evident than that this Church is either a gigantic imposture or the very Church of God? When, then, such a Church comes forward boldly and says, "I am the Ark of God, there is no safety save in me," will not the Christian be foolhardy who does not examine into the claims of this Church?

Englishmen see around them conflicting sects, an Established Church devoid of authoritative teaching, with infidelity abounding; and when all this is so, they see at the same time a Church claiming to be God-sent and God-governed, and they have not the manhood diligently and perseveringly to inquire into the claims of this Church!

Is not this wilful blindness?

Again, I would ask another question. What was the especial treatment accorded to Jesus Christ when He came with similar

claims to those put forward by the Catholic Roman Church? It was *persecution*. And what body of Christians in this nineteenth century earn the hatred of the world? Is it the Church of England? No! She is the friend of Cæsar. Is it any one of the thousand Protestant sects who take the name of Christ without the authority of Christ? No! The world knows that Protestantism is powerless to stay vice, or lust, or oppression; the infidel world scoffs at Protestantism. What then does the world *fear*, and therefore *persecute*?

The Catholic Roman Church, and none other!

She alone is persecuted; she alone is jeered at by the infidel and the fool; she alone is hated and feared by Revolutionists, Socialists, and Communists.

Were Protestant ministers shot by the Commune in Paris? No! But the Catholic archbishop, the Jesuit priests fell under their hellish fury.

Well said the great Head of the Catholic Church, Jesus Christ, that persecution must fall on the Church as it fell on Him. In Germany we find the same persecution of this Church — we find Bismarck saying, “This Church is not Cæsar’s friend.” We hear again from the Catholic bishops the answer made to Bismarck, “Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, *but* unto God the things that are God’s.”

We hear now, as of old, the power of the Church derided. We hear so-called Christians saying, “How can this Church, how can these priests, forgive sins?” Unmindful, surely, must they be that Jews of old asked, “How can this Man forgive sins?”

Yes, in one word, search into the life of Jesus of Nazareth, and seek a parallel in this nineteenth century, and you will seek in vain for a persecuted, despised, calumniated Church—save in the Church.

The Press of Europe is now inspired with a deadly hatred of Rome, and Englishmen,

forgetful of what a mean, unscrupulous brotherhood it is, pin their faith to the falsehoods propagated by the daily Press, and so literally imbibe daily poison to the soul.

Does any man desire truthfully to know the truth, let him not seek it in the *anonymous* written articles and letters of the *infidel* Press of Europe. Would a foreigner who desired to acquire knowledge of English laws and customs, ask a Fenian? Surely not. Neither then will the man who desires truly to learn concerning the calumniated Catholic Church seek it from those penny papers which are the avowed enemies of all true religion.

I have written these "Thoughts" in the hope that some Christian may read it who requires but the thought instilled in order that it may bear fruit. I can caution any to whom such a caution may be useful, that in Rome alone is to be found peace of mind,—a peace the world knows not, for it is a peace which is unearthly, which is from above, for it is the fruit of—Faith.

**R. WASHBOURNE,
PRINTER, 18 PATERNOSTER ROW,
LONDON.**

